This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

AH 6JJS D

Digitized by Google

HARVARD
DIVINITY
SCHOOL
Andover-Harvard
Theological Library

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

THE

UNIVERSALIST QUARTERLY

AND

GENERAL REVIEW.

VOLUME VI.

BOSTON:
PUBLISHED BY A. TOMPKINS.
1849.

Digitized by Google

CP.145.85

WILLIAM A. HALL, PRINTER,
22 School Street.

1210
79-5

Digitized by Google

CONTENTS.

ARTICLE. PAGE.

I.—Changes in the Religious Views of Universalists.....5

II.—Sects, Creeds, Fellowship.....15

III.—System and Principle.....22

IV.—Universalism in Europe..... 45

V.—Different kinds of Sermonizing 74

VI.—Charles Lamb 90

VII.—Literary Notices..... 105

VIII.—Religious and Ecclesiastical Affairs.....109

IX.—Deductions from the Unitarian idea of Christ.....113

X.—Old Testament Prophecies concerning Christ.....129

XI.—Whittier's Poems.....142

XII.—The Divine Law, and Divine Justice.....160

XIII.—The Seared Conscience.....168

XIV.—The Rights of the South..... 183

XV.—Mountford's Euthanasia 203

XVI.—Literary Notices.....208

XVII.—Religious and Ecclesiastical Affairs.....216

XVIII.—The Importance and Necessity of Doctrinal Preaching...221

Digitized by Google

ARTICLE. PAGE.
XIX.—Walter Savage Landor 238
XX.—Suggestions concerning the Teachings of Jesus Christ..264
XXI.—Poetry. Ode to Memory 274
XXII.—Nineveh and its Remains..... 275
XXIII.—Bushnell's Discourses.....302
XXIV.—The Biblical Argument for Capital Punishment as a Divine Ordinance..... 341
XXV.—The Spiritual Element.....358
XXVI.—Poetry. Sea Mosses.....370
XXVII.—Christian Liberty 371
XXVIII.—Inspiration of the Scriptures..... ...382
XXIX.—John Foster's Letter on Endless Punishment.....391
XXX.—Mrs. Mayo and her Writings.....397
XXXI.—Literary Notices..... 414

Digitized by Google

Period
2075
v. 6
1849

UNIVERSALIST QUARTERLY

AND

GENERAL REVIEW.

Article I.

Changes in the Religious Views of Universalists.

The doctrine of the final salvation of all men from sin and its consequences, appears to have been believed by some in almost every age, from the fathers of the church to the present time. This doctrine, however, has been presented under different phases, at different times; it has received modifications which its early promulgators never anticipated, and has passed through some changes, which probably most persons of reflection will be inclined to consider as improvements of the original system. Nor ought these modifications and changes to excite surprise, or to incur censure. Every reader of ecclesiastical history, every attentive observer of the operations of the human mind, when religion is the special subject of its regard, knows, that dogmatic theology, in every denomination, has been marked by similar mutations. Who, that has reached the age of seventy-five or eighty years, is ignorant of the fact, that what is now called Calvinism is not the scheme of divinity which bore the name when he was a young man? Who, that reflects upon the subject, does not perceive, that the preaching which he hears, and the books that he reads, though they bear the name of orthodox, are of a milder character than those which were heard and read, fifty or sixty years ago? And it is

Digitized by Google

right that changes in men's religious views should take place; as without them, there could be no growth, no improvement. It is true, that every change is not, necessarily, an improvement; but it is equally true, that where no modification of original views, no enlargement of mind, or no change in early habits of thought, occurs, there can be no advancement in knowledge.

Moreover, it ought to be remembered, that every new form of belief, which claims the attention of mankind, is, very naturally, first contemplated as a whole; and that a considerable portion of time may be expected to elapse before men will be induced, or feel prepared, to exercise their minds upon each part separately, and to mark the relation that one part holds to another. We may discover a great, central truth, and allow our minds to dwell upon it with intense thought, and deep interest; while many subordinate truths, which, so to speak, derive all their life and power from it, may remain unappreciated and unknown. In these cases, we proceed in much the same way as in acquiring the knowledge of language. We learn to speak before we study grammar, which is the science of the relation of words to each other. The first advocates of any opinions, new to their contemporaries, and treated as pernicious heresies, have commonly exhibited their mental strength in arguments of a *general* nature, rather than in *minute* and *particular* considerations, illustrative of the relations and bearings of distinct ideas, which have subsequently been arranged, and combined, and dignified by the name of a system. This arrangement and combination cannot be effected at once. Circumstances, that will elude the forecast of the shrewdest and most intellectual of the original promulgators of a new doctrine, will hereafter arise, and contribute to the developement of principles, which must have their places in his system, though they were previously unknown to himself.

These statements, we believe, are in perfect accordance with the philosophy of the human mind, and with the laws which regulate and direct the progress of knowledge. They remind us of the beautiful, but simple, language, in which our Lord described the unfolding of religious truth, which he illustrated by the developement and

Digitized by Google

growth of the grain, which exhibits "first, the blade, then, the ear, after that, the full corn in the ear."

If our remarks are founded in reason, and supported by facts, it will then appear, that the progressive disclosure of moral truth is a part of the divine order, and controlled by unchangeable laws. That the mind of man is capable of enlargement; that its perception of truth may acquire clearness and strength by continued exercise; and that we may advance in the knowledge of any subject of our consideration, in proportion as we study it minutely and extensively; these are facts, that few, if any, will feel disposed to deny. They will certainly be admitted in all scientific concerns. And we can conceive of no sufficient reason, why religion, or a single truth of religion, should be made an exception to the general laws, whose operation is so apparent in all subordinate affairs. Truth, we know, is "the same yesterday, to-day, and forever." But the recipients of truth are not always in the same condition. "Their understandings may be darkened." They may be incapable of receiving more than the mere rudiments of a doctrine, or a system of faith. But whenever they increase in knowledge, whether it be in common science, or in religious attainments, every new acquisition will depend upon the enlargement of the mind, the free exercise of its powers, and an earnest desire of improvement. Truth will come to the human spirit, as the want of it is felt.

The remarks, which we have made in relation to this portion of our subject, will, we think, be found to apply, in all their force, to the promulgation and progress of Universalism in this country, and to the changes which have taken place in the opinions of a large majority of its advocates. There cannot be a reasonable doubt, that the doctrine of the ultimate happiness of all intelligent beings, was first announced and defended on Calvinistic grounds. It may not be strictly correct to say, that Universalism is a *natural* offshoot of Calvinism; it may be more proper to call it a scion that was engrafted upon a Calvinistic stock. And if the question should be asked, why this basis of the doctrine was taken? the answer is obvious; there was no other to take. There may, indeed, have been some few exceptions to this statement. There may

Digitized by Google

have been men, whose theological reading had made them acquainted with other views of the way of salvation, than those which emanated from the Genevan school; and of this number, Mr. Murray may have been one. But whether he was so, or not, his writings sufficiently prove, that he considered Calvinistic principles as forming the only true and safe foundation of the doctrines which he preached. And with regard to the preachers, who were natives of America, particularly those who commenced their labors nearly at the same time with Murray, we have no reason to believe, that they were acquainted with any theories of divinity excepting that which was most popular; and this was highly Calvinistic. From all we can learn of their public discourses, we are compelled to view them, as defending Universalism on the ground of the atoning sacrifice of Christ, who was supposed to have suffered and died in the sinner's place. These statements will apply, with some limitation, to the preachers, who came into the field after those to whom we have just alluded. They did not always, or often, perhaps, present Calvinistic principles, as constituting the basis of their faith; but they *tacitly* admitted their truth; they did not openly oppose them, nor suggest any thing as a substitute. Their hearers considered them, as standing on the same ground with the most Orthodox, with the exception only of believing in the salvation of the whole world.

And it is very natural to suppose that when the preachers of Universalism adopted the course we have mentioned, they possessed some advantages, which they could not have enjoyed, in case of pursuing a different line of procedure. When they came before their hearers, professing the cardinal doctrines, as they were called, of the Reformation; doctrines, which had always received the sanction of the ablest divines of the American Church, and the unwavering credence of a vast majority of its members; they seem to have had but little to do, excepting to erect with skill, and with proper materials, the contemplated superstructure, on a foundation already prepared for them. The Scriptures, which they, as well as the Orthodox, professed to regard as the rule of their faith, were known to abound in terms of universality, to which it was not easy

Digitized by Google

to give a limited interpretation. It required no unnatural or forced construction of the passages in which those terms are found, to show that Christ's propitiatory sacrifice, and his advocacy before his Father's throne, were intended to exert a universal influence, in bringing all men to God. And when the Calvinists urged the doctrine of election and reprobation against the Universalists, the former must have found it extremely difficult to reconcile those articles of their creed with the universal call to faith and repentance, and with the repeated promises of pardon and acceptance on complying with those conditions, that occur so frequently in the gospel. The believer in particular election could not easily show the reasonableness of consigning the non-elect sinner to eternal perdition, in default of faith in Christ; when, by the very terms of his own creed, he had no right to believe in Christ, who did not die to save him, and hence laid no foundation for his faith. And if an argument was advanced against the doctrine of universal salvation, on the ground, that the justice of God, which was represented as awfully vindictive, required the condemnation of the impenitent; the answer was ready: that justice had received satisfaction in the death of the surety; and it would be most unjust to exact the punishment of sin twice, once of the substitute, and then of the original offender.

From this brief review of the prevalent opinions of the American community when Universalism was first published here, it appears highly probably, if not absolutely certain, that the circumstances to which we have alluded, had no small influence in securing success to the labors of the early preachers of that doctrine. To what other cause can we reasonably attribute the success of Mr. Murray, in the work of proselyting? That he possessed popular talents; that his ready wit, his pleasant voice, his natural pulpit action, were highly attractive, will be admitted by all who knew the man. But these circumstances, however influential on hearers of a certain class, will hardly account for the results which followed his labors, in many parts of New England. Many, if not the greater portion of his earliest converts were men who had long been members of Orthodox churches, in which they had been regarded as leaders. They had arrived at

Digitized by Google

mature age, and had passed the period when the imagination, rather than the judgement, bears sway. Besides, their minds were so deeply imbued with the principles of their early religious education, that it is exceedingly doubtful, whether Universalism in any other form, than that in which they received it, would have ever commanded their assent. But this doctrine, announced, as it was, in accordance with ideas that they had always considered as forming "the pillar and ground of the truth," brought with it a conciliating quality, which, if it did not positively commend it to their acceptance, was yet adapted to prevent premature and uncandid decisions, and to induce free and deliberate investigation.

That Mr. Murray did not, in his first ministerial labors in this country, openly and directly proclaim the doctrine of universal salvation, appears from good authority, to be a fact. Why he did not, may be a question, which different persons may answer in different ways. That he was ever ashamed of his religious opinions, or lacked moral courage, we can scarcely believe. He had already suffered for his faith, in his native country; and would he be withheld, by fear, from declaring it in his adopted country, then struggling for civil and religious freedom? To our mind, the most probable reason for his conduct is this: he was aware that the greatest number of his hearers, in all places, were Calvinists; and that the principles of that order lay at the foundation of his own faith and preaching. And in these circumstances, he might consider it the wisest and best course, to allow his hearers to draw their own conclusions from the premises, which he laid down, and which both he and they admitted to be sound and incontrovertible.

In these remarks upon the ministerial character, public labors and general success of Mr. Murray, we would not be understood to make an invidious distinction between him and others, or to undervalue the talents and services of those, who were engaged in the same work. Messrs. Adam Streeter, Zebulon Streeter, and Caleb Rich, are to be considered as earnest coadjutors with Mr. Murray, though they were not, for some time, associated with him. Of the first of these we never had any personal knowledge; but from some of those, who often attended on his

Digitized by Google

ministry, we have learned, that he possessed good, natural powers; that he spoke with great ease and fluency, and that to those, who were prepared to admit the truth of the premises from which he reasoned, and to allow the justness of his interpretations of Scripture, he seldom failed to carry conviction.[1] His brother, Zebulon Streeter, was an amiable and excellent man, of gentle, unassuming, conciliating temper and manners; with no tendency of mind to ultraism of any description; of a ready wit, which was kept within the limits of propriety by his habitual prudence; not addicted to wild speculation, nor forced and unnatural interpretations of the Scriptures; possessing such a knowledge of our language, as enabled him to speak with correctness and propriety, and exhibiting, in his life and practice, the influence of evangelical truth. Mr. Rich was a plain, but intelligible preacher,

[1] *Note by the Editor.* In order to preserve one or two notices of early Universalists, which I have received from the writer of this article, I append them here.

1. "Matthew Wright was a Dane by birth, of the Moravian faith. He was educated at the University of Copenhagen, was a man of eminent literary attainments, able to converse, pray or preach as well in Latin as in his mother tongue. I know not when he came to America, nor whether he had been a preacher before he came, or not. But my impression is, that he had been a Moravian missionary somewhere. He was a Universalist in his early youth, and used to speak of the affectionate remonstrances of his mother against his heresy. He was Calvinistic, and continued a Moravian in all respects excepting the idea of the universality of salvation. He was "pure in heart" and in life, of the most sweet and amiable dispositions. He lived in uncomplaining, cheerful poverty; frequently teaching schools in the country towns, and preaching when requested. I know not when, nor where, he died. These items of information I had from an aged member of Mr. Murray's society, when I was a young man."

2. "I know nothing of Adam Streeter, previous to his appearance as a Universalist preacher. He was, doubtless, a man of good natural powers, which had not been much, or well, cultivated. His brother Zebulon has often told me that Adam was a very free, easy, eloquent speaker. The Calvinistic elements entered largely into his discourses. His was the *debt and credit* theory of redemption. To illustrate this fact, and at the same time to give you an idea of his talents as an interpreter of Scripture and biblical critic, I will refer to the tenor of a discourse of his on Gen. iv. 7. 'If thou doest not well, sin lieth at the door;" — that is, sin is placed to Christ's account, as the sinner's surety; and Christ himself says 'I am the door.' This account of the sermon I had from an old friend, who was delighted with the sentiment! I never saw Mr. Streeter."

Digitized by Google

who affected nothing brilliant or ornamental in his discourses. He had read the Scriptures much, and with great attention, and quoted them readily and appropriately. His life and conversation adorned his profession.

In this connection, we may observe, that the Rev. Isaac Foster of West Stafford, Conn., was known, during many of the last years of his life, as a Restorationist. He was settled over a Congregational society, and was, for a time, in fellowship with the clergy of that order. We believe, that he was an Arminian,[2] in the earliest part of his ministry; but probably did not often urge the doctrines of his faith upon his hearers, to the exclusion of more important topics. But at length, his more Orthodox brethren called him to a rigorous account, and finally excluded him from their fellowship. But whether this took place before, or after, he had avowed his belief in the restoration of all men, we are unable to determine. His society, among whom, doubtless, his religious views had long been silently working their way, retained him as their pastor to the end of his days. His opinions were very similar to those of Dr. Chauncy. He possessed a strong mind, and was a close and powerful reasoner.

While it cannot be considered strange, or unnatural, that persons who were educated in the Calvinistic belief, should, on becoming Universalists, incorporate some of its principles with those of their new faith; it can be no more a cause of wonder, that they should, subsequently, find reasons for other changes of opinion; or that they should feel warranted in renouncing those religious views, that they once esteemed of vital importance. The mind, that has broken its attachment to "the traditions of the fathers," in one instance, has partially tested its native strength; and will seldom feel satisfied with a limited

[2] Mr. Foster was a decided and uncompromising enemy of Calvinism in all its forms. This will appear from the following anecdote. Being once in company with Dr. Huntington, the author of the work entitled "Calvinism Improved," Mr. Foster said something that indicated his dislike of that system, when the Dr. observed, that "the true character of the system was not developed, and therefore could not be appreciated; but that a time would come, when its merits would be perceived, as it would appear in a greatly improved form." To this Mr. Foster replied, "Sir, Calvinism is as good now, as it will ever be; it is utterly incapable of any improvement."

Digitized by Google

progress; but will rather follow out the work of improvement to various, successive results. A form of belief may be satisfactory to him who holds it, till by some process of reason, or from some want of his spiritual nature, he learns its inefficiency, and is disposed to seek for something better. While men believe in the infinity of sin, in the vindictive and inexorable justice of God, and in the necessity of a vicarious atonement; they may be satisfied with the theory of redemption, which represents Christ, the second person in the trinity, as voluntarily suffering in their stead, and thus cancelling the debt which they owed to divine justice. They may survey this scheme from one stand-point only, namely, its result, and be pleased with it, because it seems to meet the only want of their nature of which they are then conscious. It is said, that imaginary diseases have been cured by imaginary remedies. Men may be satisfied with a scheme of divinity which embraces the doctrine of particular election, especially, if they believe that they are of the number chosen; but if they find, on a patient and dispassionate examination, that this scheme, however gratifying to their selfish feelings, fails to meet the wants of their intellectual nature; if they find it impossible to reconcile it with the benevolence of God, they will reject it, and seek for something more accordant with reason and the best affections of their hearts. Where these elements are wanting, our belief is, at best, nothing but an indolent assent.

It may be remarked in this connection, that our Calvinistic brethren and those who first professed a belief in the doctrine of universal salvation, stood on common ground. Both were satisfied with the results of their respective, distinguishing doctrines. The one believed, that the vicarious sacrifice of Christ, and the imputation of his righteousness, secured the salvation of all the elect; and the other, that the same means would prove effectual in the redemption of the whole family of man.

But this state of things could not always last. The Universalists appear to have taken the lead of other denominations in announcing Unitarian views of the person of Christ, and of the nature of the atonement. Though, as we have said before, the preachers of this order were understood to found their belief on Calvinistic

Digitized by Google

principles; yet there might be some among them, who had attained to clearer and more rational conceptions of the sense of the Scriptures, in relation to these topics. We can speak of the change in their mode of preaching, from memory only. It was not till the year 1795, that we noticed any change at all. Others, it is possible, may have discovered it before. There may have been many preachers, who electrified and astounded some of their auditors with the announcement of the doctrine of Christ's subordination to the Father, and with the novel idea of reconciliation, as affecting human beings alone. We, however, heard these statements and the arguments in support of them, for the first time, in the year above mentioned. The preacher, on that occasion, was the author of the "Treatise on Atonement." This was published in 1805. In it the principal objections to the Calvinistic scheme of atonement are fairly stated, and forcible arguments adduced in defence of the opinions now generally held by Unitarians in the United States and in Great Britain. This work may be considered as the first of the kind, published in America, which embodies Unitarian views, and which has had a wide circulation. At a somewhat earlier date, the Rev. Mr. Sherman, a Congregational minister in Connecticut, who had imbibed Arian opinions, published (1803,) a small volume in their defence. But it was suppressed, as far as it could be done, and never was read to any considerable extent.

We have known of other changes in the religious sentiments of Universalists; but of these we need not say much, as they have been noticed in another part of this work.[3] But if it is true, as is there intimated, that "another change may be said to have begun within a few of the last years, when the current of opinion has run more strongly in favor of a moral connection of the present life with the future, and when the sharp outlines of doctrines in general have been softened down, if not sometimes obliterated;" we can only say, that we rejoice in this evidence of progress, in which Universalists appear to be following in the track of other religious communities, who, after a time, chiefly employed in defending

[3] See Vol. V. No. 1. p. 80.

Digitized by Google

their distinguishing tenets, turn their thoughts to subjects, which form a common ground, on which they can stand, side by side, with their brethren who bear different names. It seems to be a part of the order of Providence, that a sect, or a denomination, which acquires its designation from a peculiar form of belief, should, in time, find its particular opinions merged in general truth, and its public instructions assuming a more practical character.

E. T.

Article II.

Sects, Creeds, Fellowship.

I do not propose a full discussion of either of these topics at present, but simply desire to submit a few considerations in regard to each; or upon the general subject which they may be said to embrace. There would seem to be some rather vague notions concerning it, floating around, and many things said, that appear to me either unmeaning or very erroneous. Indeed, one would almost get the impression, from some sources, that every thing *sectarian* was opposed to true religion; that all *creeds* were but the very creatures of Satan; and all *fellowship*, narrow-minded and illiberal, except such perhaps as consists of a kind of good-natured feeling towards every body.

I have little sympathy with such opinions. I believe in the necessity and propriety of sects in religion. That they are imperfect institutions, sometimes highly so; that they have faults, many and grievous; that they sometimes oppress, abuse, and persecute; may be admitted, or otherwise, so far as this point is concerned. For I presume that however willing one might be to admit the wrongs they practise, he would hardly claim that these were essential conditions of a sectarian existence. They are not elemental but circumstantial. And the true idea of a sect embraces nothing that is inconsistent with an

Digitized by Google

honest and sincere faith, and a spirit as candid and generous as that of Christ himself. Entire and general uniformity of belief cannot be expected. Sects are the inevitable consequence. Wherever a number of individuals hold in common some peculiar religious opinions, or even agree only in one great central idea, more especially if they have any organization, or concerted scheme of operations for inculcating what they believe, do they not constitute all that is essential to a *sect?* The conditions I have supposed certainly realize the proper meaning of that term. They are a sect, whatever assumption of catholicism may appear to the contrary. If they disclaim the abuses and perversions of sectarianism, it is very well; but if they deny a sectarian existence, it is evidently incorrect. They have all the necessary elements of a sect, and to some extent possess the force and do the work of a sect. Indeed, beginning with the most Orthodox or conservative body, and following out the radiating lines of dissenters and reformers, it is remarkable how strictly each distinct class, nearer or more remote, fulfils all the essential conditions of a sect; however widely differing from other classes, or even among themselves, in reference to other particulars. And if I were to look for a very striking exhibition of this fact, I would go, sooner than anywhere else perhaps, among those whose principal characteristic was a professed opposition to every thing like sect. A puritan of the old school would make a very warm sectarian, but it would require a nominal hater of all sects to make one furiously so.

The demands of human reason, of common sense even, for order, method, and coöperation in any common enterprize, seem to require a sectarian existence. Very few have that perverse individuality which will not admit of it. Almost every one finds, between himself and at least a few others, points of similarity in faith. And where these are recognized, and any efforts made for their inculcation or defence, sectarian forms and organization become necessary. This seems but natural and proper; and the great outcry raised against it evidently comes from a strange confounding of its abuses with the thing itself. A handful of come-outers, zealous to excess of individual freedom, acknowledging no law but that of each

Digitized by Google

person unto himself, and scoffing at the idea of any authoritative regulation, as something which ought to be spurned; get up a meeting for the agitation of their notions, and coolly go to work and *organize* it as an essential preliminary! And the great body of anti-sectarians are about as wise, about as consistent. No sooner has the centrifugal force carried them without the attractive limits of other sects, than a new centripetal seems to exert its power, and turns them in towards a common union-point of their own. From their hatred of sect they become a sect, and from warring against sectarianism, become violently sectarian. I do not object to this: that is, I do not complain of the fact that such are sectarian; they must be so. I only object to their inconsistency in making so much noise because others are sectarian. As an example of the ease with which dissenters fall into the very order of things, essentially, that they profess to despise in other classes, I will suppose a case which may find its parallel in the history of a few past years. Because it is fancied that too much authority is attributed to Jesus Christ, or for some other equally valid reason, the most liberal form of Christianity becomes distasteful to a few restless spirits; and, leaving their old associates and the common basis on which they toiled and suffered together, they adopt new ground and set up for themselves. Then follows a war of opinions. The older sect points to its ancient landmarks, and terms the "new light" a mere "will o' the wisp." Forthwith the dissenters make a new and remarkable discovery. They see for the first time that sects are very bad things. Sectarianism is pronounced horribly unchristian; it is the real beast, hoofed and horned for all evil. True, these very persons have lived for years, perhaps, very cosily and comfortably in the arms of a sect. They not only saw it doing, but aided it to do, the very same things, in every essential particular, that it attempts to practise now, and no suspicion of its faults or imperfections existed then. They were, in all respects, fully as sectarian as their brethren, and never suspected its exceeding wickedness for a single moment. But now, their eyes are fairly opened. Sects, they perceive, are great abominations; not referring to their wicked practices, but to the very institutions them-

Digitized by Google

selves. They will have nothing to do with any thing of this kind. No, they are far too liberal, too catholic, for so narrow a sphere. They "stand upon the broad ground of Humanity." But they have a work to do, and means must be used, and a train of operations put in motion for its performance. Now, the new *sect* commences. Some one or more hoists a new flag, and, truer to their instincts than to their reason, every "new light" and anti-sectarian rallies under it. They find some point of affinity, and range themselves around it as readily as steel-dust would encircle a magnet. Some approach perhaps is made to an organization. A systematic mode of operations begins. They establish pulpits and presses, organs of communicating with the public; the clannish spirit shows itself, and lo! they display all the marks and lineaments of a sect as unblushingly as though they really considered such features respectable. Thus, wherever an affinity of opinion obtains between the members of any class, holding the position of dissenters, a sectarian existence becomes necessary and proper.

Leaving this particular, however, I would proceed to remark that creeds are essential to sects. There can be no sect without its creed. The reason would seem too obvious to require much explanation. The existence of one presupposes the existence of the other. The creed is the vital principle of the sect. And a body without a spirit, or a spirit without a body, would be no more anomalous than one of these without the other. It can hardly be supposed that I am using the word creed in any new or improper sense here. So far from this, I would confine it strictly to its legitimate signification. I would be much more cautious, in this respect, than the creed-hater seems to be, who confounds it with much that has no proper connection with it; who uses it as synonymous with bigotry, intolerance, superstition, narrow-mindedness, mental slavery, and the spirit of persecution. I mean by it the particulars of religious belief which any number of individuals hold in common, and some portion of which, at least, distinguish them from other classes. And in this, its true sense, I repeat that every sect necessarily has its creed. This creed may consist of thirty-nine articles, or any less number; it may have but one

Digitized by Google

item even, and that held somewhat like the following: "I believe that all creeds are unchristian;" still the sect has its creed, as essentially as St. Athanasius did.

This creed may be written or unwritten; it makes no material difference. It is not the formality of drawing it up and signing it, that gives it existence; this is merely one form of expressing the fact of its existence; and the fact itself must precede this expression. It is not the parchment or the ink that really constitutes the creed; its true being is in the minds and hearts of its believers. In fact, if it does not exist there, its formal declaration is nothing but a falsehood; and if it does, then he as truly possesses it, who never writes and signs an article, as he who formally puts his name to one. The only material difference between the two, seems to be, that the latter adopts this very frank and open method of expressing the more prominent or distinctive particulars of his belief, while the former chooses other methods of doing essentially the same thing.

What, then, does all the cant, that we hear now-a-days about creeds, amount to? What sense or consistency has it? Have these pretended creed-haters any opinions of their own? Then they have a creed. Do they not talk about these opinions, preach about them, illustrate, defend, and endeavor to disseminate them? And more than this, do they not *write out* these opinions, *fix their own names* to them, and publish them to the world, in the form of books, newspapers, tracts, pamphlets, etc. etc.? Then have they written and signed a creed, just as truly and essentially as ever did a venerable Professor at Andover, or any one else. Here, too, let me say, I have no objection to the thing itself. It is perfectly proper that they, as well as other sects, should have their creed, and choose their own method of announcing it to the world. But it does appear somewhat ludicrous, and I may add, positively ridiculous, that there should be so much canting about it, such pretended abhorrence of the practice of those who simply prefer another method of doing virtually the same thing. In some of these cases, the absurdity shows a face of such monkey-like gravity, that one's mirth conquers his indignation. Take the following, which is one of the latest and richest specimens I

Digitized by Google

have seen. The Iowa State Convention of Universalists held its annual session in the month of September last. After indulging in the usual amount of cant about creeds, which is becoming so very popular among us, and after condemning *all creeds*, as containing the very essence of almost every nameable abomination, the Convention proceeded, with most admirable consistency, to enact as follows:[1]

"Art. 3. This association will acknowledge no creed or confession of faith, except a simple recognition of the truth of the Christian religion, as revealed in the Bible, but will extend its fellowship and communion to all who may wish to enjoy it: provided they have faith in God, the Universal Father, in mankind as the immortal subjects of the divine government, and in Christ as the highest manifestation of the moral attributes of God to the human race; and, provided further, that their lives are regulated by the great moral law of Christianity, which is fulfilled in love to God and man."

All this solemn utterance comes to us tricked out in the harlequin costume of such other declarations, as that "creeds are like iron shoes to the feet:" that they "produce pain and deformity, and make religious dwarfs of us," etc.

Before dismissing this topic, I would offer a single remark upon what seems to be the only plausible objection to a formal creed, signed by the members or ministers of a sect. It is said that they are unfavorable to the true freedom and growth of the individual. But surely this is no necessary result of such a procedure. In putting my name to a creed, or to a declaration of certain particulars of my religious belief, I do not consider that I am imposing the slightest fetter upon my freedom. The act itself is a free one; and I do not regard it in the light of a pledge farther than this: I promise to maintain and be faithful to those particulars, or that creed, so long as I believe that they are true; but, of course, not a moment longer. And I feel under the same obligation, and to the same extent, in regard to religious opinions uttered in common conversation, preached from the pulpit, or sent

[1] New York Christian Messenger, Vol. 18, No. 3.

Digitized by Google

from under my own hand to the world through the agency of the press. As I have before suggested, they are but different modes of doing essentially the same thing, and the same objections that could be started in regard to either, would bear equally against all.

In conclusion, let me say a few words upon the subject of Fellowship. In its technical sense, as used by religionists, this term implies an agreement of opinion upon those peculiar articles of belief which constitute the basis of a sectarian existence, and the good moral character of those for whom it is cherished. Such is its uniform signification among all Christians. It will be seen, therefore, that it is appropriate only among members of the same sect, so far as they are true to their sectarian basis, or bond of union. A Calvinist has no fellowship for me, as a Calvinist, nor can he have any so long as he is a Calvinist. I have none for him, as a Universalist, however worthy or deserving I may consider him morally. In the same sense, I have none for the Atheist, or the Pantheist, or the Deist. I cannot have; and should I, from mere good nature, or any other cause, say that I had, it would be only to assert an untruth. Do any such complain of this? What reason have they to do so? Do they say that they have fellowship for me,—that they are not so illiberal as to refuse it on account of my religious faith; and, therefore, I ought to extend it to them? Let me ask, in reply, What do you mean by fellowship? Simply, kind feelings, fraternal regard, charity, or something of this kind? Then you imply by it only the exercise of some of the common Christian virtues, such as are due to all men! If this is really what you mean by it, do you not *get* quite as much as you *give?*

But this is dropping entirely its popular signification among religionists, and giving it quite a new meaning. If used thus it should always be accompanied with an interpretation until Christians understand it. But why should we give "Letters of Fellowship," or the "Right hand of Fellowship," to any one, in that case? All would be entitled to them alike, and the form would be insignificant. And if you use the term in its common acceptation; then I reply that I have quite as much fellowship for you as you have for me. You have surely

Digitized by Google

no regard for my faith, nor have I any for yours. Each party is plainly right, in this respect, and let us abide by it. Call things by their right names and then we shall be better understood. If you ask for fellowship, meaning only the exercise of some Christian virtues, and will so explain it, I will acknowledge the justice of your claims, and endeavor faithfully to regard them. But if you thus sieze upon this term as a mere *ruse*, and, by using it in a new and unexplained sense, endeavor to obtain an apparent sanction of principles which to me are abhorrent, it is enough to say that I should be cautious about acceding to your wishes. And if you mean by it what Christians generally mean, then you ask for that which I cannot give, and which moreover, you know that you cannot give me? So that, take it which way you will, you will perceive that my rule of action, in this respect, is precisely the same as your own; and all the difference between us, with respect to it is, that I act openly, and you covertly.

Briefly, then, to sum up what I have to say upon the matter at present; with the condition of the religious world what it now is, it is right and proper that there should be sects. It is right and proper that each sect should have its creed. And it is equally right and proper that each sect should have a fellowship restricted to its own members.

M. B.

Article III.

System and Principle.

We propose, in this article, to consider the difference between System and Principle. We shall endeavor to show that there is such a difference, and that important practical results depend upon it. By *System* we mean a scheme, or code, or formula, which may be instrumental to the attainment of some great end, like Truth, or Virtue,

Digitized by Google

but which often usurps the place of that end, and in which the mind becomes fixed and limited. What we here term "System," is sometimes called "habit," "routine," "formality." By *Principle* we mean the great end alluded to, the essential Truth, the most excellent Virtue, the supreme Law, not to be fore-ordained by any pre-conception, or constrained by any scheme, or excluded by any establishment. If we were called upon to show the difference between the two by abstract definitions, we should say that Principle deals with premises, detects original and intrinsic fallacies;—System revolves upon the round of deduction and never refers to premises. Principle is the absolute Good and Right—System is the conventional and the customary. Principle is fluent and infinite, sufficient for all occasions—System compresses Truth in set methods and alloys it. System opens for our vision peculiar apertures, and confines it to segments of the horizon—Principle yields us the whole sweep of the firmament. System is selfish, Principle is universal. System is sectarian, Principle is catholic. System is a tradition, Principle is an inspiration.

But we detect the difference between these two more readily in *men* and in *events*, than in abstract terms. Between individuals, then, we instinctively acknowledge this distinction—the man of Principle and the man of System. The one is liberal, universal, spiritual. The other is literal, technical, narrow. Let us view them in various attitudes. Consider them, in the first place, as *controversialists*, or *reasoners*. The man of System never goes beyond a certain routine of position of ideas. He sees vertically, or parallel, but never takes an outside, or lateral view. It never occurs to him that the platform on which he stands may be but a fragment, that an infinitude of truth encompasses him. His premises, once adopted and set down, seem fast-set as the pillars of the universe, never to be taken up for revision. Hence he is often intense in power and clear in logic, but not catholic, or progressive, or great. The man of Principle, on the other hand, is bound to the true and not the adopted, and constantly waits for new revelations. He defies the poor accusation of "inconsistency;" for though he may have shifted his position to-day from that of yesterday, this is

Digitized by Google

only a relative inconsistency. It is inconsistency with System, but absolute consistency with Truth. Yesterday he took observation under such a sky, and with such instruments as were vouchsafed him. To-day, some veil of mist has lifted and given him a wider horizon, and loyalty to truth calls him yonder.

Again;—take these men as *citizens, as members of the Commonwealth.* Even in the rush of political action, the man of Principle has but one standard of conduct, and that is the highest standard. He forgets not his manhood in allegiance to party. His patriotism is of that ripe and genial kind which considers the world as our country; and though it may be rooted to a particular locality, as the soil of its birth, and cling there in ancestral ashes for nourishment, it branches out with a love and aspiration that cover the earth. He is a true Democrat, for he bears in his heart all people as God's children. He is a true Whig, for he is always loyal to freedom—protests against the abuse of to-day, the toryism of selfishness—nor contents himself with boasting what his fathers did in revolutionary yesterdays, whose heresy time has made orthodox, and humanity consecrated. Nor can he suffer the name of patriotism to sanctify wrong, nor will he distinguish morality or humanity by national lines, nor make a false law on parchment greater than God's Law, which is graven on the two tables of stone, and in the human heart. But, the man of System is nothing but a politician or partisan. He is strenuous for measures but seems never inspired by ideas; or else he is devoted to traditionary ideas, which, true in their original meaning, and relatively true in their original application, have become so soiled, and beaten out, and misapprehended, as to be a mockery of themselves, if they have not "perished in the using." A parasite of party routine, his thoughts revolve in the narrowest political machinery. He ploughs up some superficial stratum of monetary interest, or threshes out some chaff of policy; while that which lies deep as the heart of humanity is not touched; the action which reaches to the life and the soul, works all outside his system.

In short, consider these two in the whole aspect and history of their lives. The one is the creature of *convention*—the man of *facts.* He represents the average good

Digitized by Google

and evil. He will never shock us by an informal act, or an original idea. In *business*, he will be as moral as the laws of trade. He will be prompt and diligent, losing neither custom nor credit. He will consider that conscience has its claims, and will not plumply violate them. Nay, conscience, being itself systematized, will not be apt to trouble him. It will be a snug, respectable conscience; not inexpedient, nor fanatical, nor crazed about abstractions. As to *the amenities of life*, he will be as courteous as the rules of etiquette. He will be punctilious in all the proprieties; solicitious as to the fashion. His house, dress, equipage, will be strictly according to his caste. He will countenance no vulgar vice; but he will not entertain any puritanical scruples, and will beware of ultraism. He patronizes the Gospel idea of humanity, and gives something to the poor; but he is very careful about "morbid sentiment," and "humbugs." As to his *Religion*, there being a stratafied consistency to his character, he, of course, places that uppermost, and *by itself;* but, nevertheless, it is of a piece with his social conduct and his business operations. It is an item which has its place in the catalogue of a well-ordered life. It is an important advantage to a man, besides being an ornament to his character. Therefore, he reverently receives it as it has been handed down to him; acquieses in its demands upon his belief; and endeavors to make some adjustment between it and his deeds. Now we are ready to admit that such a man has many excellencies. We would not overlook the advantages of System in every department of action. But we object that with him it is *mere* system. His conceptions have run into a narrow mould, and become petrified. His movements are mechanical. He has no breadth or spontaneousness. He merely represents the civilization to which he belongs. He always moves in the the plane of the ecliptic; but he has no individual centre or completeness. He has no radical character, no independent personality. He is not a cause, but an effect. He is homogeneous with the society about him. He is a fragment of a concrete mass. His respectable life comes from conformity, not loyalty; from traditional obedience, not original love.

It is not so with the man of Principle. Of couse, he

Digitized by Google

does not live without method or forethought, nor is his peculiarity eccentricity. But he differs from the mere man of system, because, first of all, he has *an idea of Life.* He looks about him, and asks — "What is Life?" Is it a mere accident — an evolution of chance — a play of electric forces, suddenly ceasing? Or is it but a sensual opportunity, a race, a game, a market? Or is it a fact of eternal affinities, the veil and vestibule of a greater reality, the agent of a use beyond itself? Having found his answer in this last question, he straightway addresses himself to the true end of his being. He acts as one who has faith in his immortal relations. He is not, like the other, a man of mere facts; he sets above the actual forms around him an *ideal* to which he continually aspires. He is not satisfied with the routine of ordinary morality. He does not rest with the fulfillment of any ritual or decalogue, or with any overt obedience. He halts not upon present attainments. His cycle of duty widens as he ascends. The voices of to-morrow call him forward from the goal of to-day. The world is transparent to his vision. He sees the phenomena of life unfolded and defined in their spiritual relations. Its realities are thrown before him in true perspective. He acts not by tradition, but by reason; not from the mechanism of habit, but from the inspiration of a fresh and living conscience. In business, he observes not merely a conventional morality. He needs not the restrictions of seal or signature, or any legal instrument. He deals in solitude as in public, at midnight as in the sunshine. His heart is the throne of honor, and his open brow the witness of manly integrity. His grasped hand is as good as a bond, and his promise as sterling gold. The complicated interests of men, which so often jar and conflict, are reconciled in him with a beautiful harmony. He is himself a state, an institution, the embodiment of justice, the symbol of a perfect society. But his communion with man is not merely through the intercourse of traffic, which exposes the sordid qualities of humanity and hides its better elements. He is characterized by an expansive philanthropy. His heart is warm with fraternal affections — its inmost fibres are welded to the interests of his race. His courtesy, therefore, is not the thawing of a frigid eti-

Digitized by Google

quette; but the spontaneous overflow of a genial disposition. His charities are not the droppings of a formal pity, but the ointment of a yearning love. He has learned and he practices the divinest of the virtues—self-sacrifice. He is a full-orbed and many-sided man. He is never out of place, or time. All the sympathies are quick and instinctive in him. He is neither an ascetic, nor an epicurean. In his soul there is a fountain of humor, and, close by, a fountain of tears. His spirit is an instrument strung to every proper mood; touched by the light graces of the passing hour, or swept "by solemn thoughts that wander through eternity." Of course, he is not a mere man of the world. He does not spend all his life there, nor has his character become shaped to its expression. He often extricates himself from it, retires to a higher level, and overlooks it. As his religion has diffused a consecration into every thing, so it draws him to commune with that Being in whom every thing is contained. And it is the peculiarity of his religion, that it is a vivid realization of the instant presence and the supreme excellence of God. Therefore he acts as he believes. His round of obedience is not the drag of fearful submission, but the gravitation of his whole nature.

We find the difference between System and Principle, then, in all methods of action; in all classes of men. We recognize it in common terms of distinction, such as *catholicism* and *bigotry*, *pedantry* and *scholarship*, *talent* and *genius*. One man is a successful *advocate*. He knows the subtlest windings of litigation, can detect instinctively the flaw in a plea or an indictment, and touch exactly those springs of human nature that will move to his purposes. But place him in a wider theatre, and he shrinks almost into insignificance. A great question appals and stifles him. He cannot compass its relations, or handle its issues. So he only haggles at it, or remains dumb and inefficient. But another man is not only an advocate, familiar with the forms of his profession, and successful in its labors; but he adjusts himself to the dimensions of Senates; is equal to the most important crises, and, as by intuition, stands forth in the prominent and massive character of a great statesman. Indeed, it is the peculiarity of such a man that, place him where you

Digitized by Google

will, he is competent to his condition; he is always "at home," and makes all circumstances flexible. He employs routine for the ends of routine; but when this fails he always has an expedient. He does not violate any law, but he sometimes suspends it; he oversweeps it by a higher law. Napoleon would not be hampered and endangered by the old tactics; so, with the sudden inspiration of a principle, he flung his whole force, like an avalanche, first upon one wing of the enemy, then upon the other, and scattered all before him. We must study contemporary poets and dramatists, vitiated as they were by the taste of their age, and marred by the conceits of system, before we can fully realize the universal genius of Shakespear, or the colossal grandeur of Milton.

Let no one suppose that we overlook the claims of System. It is essential to all practical conduct, and without it, Principle remains an abstraction. In nothing is the power of the mind more beautifully apparent, than in the method and order by which it applies the loftiest truth, and secures the most important ends. We admire its triumphs in this way, whether we witness them in a scientific process, or a form of government — in the developement of character, or in a piece of mechanism. Indeed, it is one of the great prerogatives of mind, to deduce and apply — to *systematize*. But what we maintain is, that System should always be the conscious product of principle. Principle should always dictate the rule, and, in the application of the rule, there should be constant reference to principle. The man of Principle is not less a man of System than the other, but, unlike the other, he is not a mere man of System. He is not locked up in it. He uses it, and knows why he uses it. He uses it, but he is not controlled by it. He acts in system from the principle, and, when necessary, he supersedes it by the principle.

Having thus illustrated and defined the distinction between System and Principle, we now propose to apply it in a consideration of three of the most prominent departments of human action at the present day, SCIENCE, REFORM, RELIGION.

We observe, then, in the first place, that the history of natural science furnishes a familiar instance of the dis-

Digitized by Google

tinction which we are now treating. The Philosophy of Aristotle ruled the world for ages. Splendid intellects toiled in its mazy web, and spun from it most brilliant theories. But it was the Philosophy of System, not of Principle. It took certain premises for granted, and never revised them. It considered nature not in its own simplicity, but through the subjective lens of the intellect. Winds, oceans, minerals, plants, the host of heaven, were catalogued and described according to speculative conceit, by an occult nominalism. So this System guaged and tested all things. The mind was free to argue in its circle; but no one thought, or, at least, dared express his thought, of going outside that circle, to see whether its horizon was merely one of human vision, or whether it was really the arc of infinity. The learned bowed to it in reverence. The church threw around it all her mighty and venerable sanctions. But, at length, old Nature broke forth and vindicated herself through the starry revelations of Copernicus, and the common-sense of Bacon. The shapely conceits of speculation and of system, scattered like ghosts to the nooks of cloisters, and entombed themselves in libraries; never again to "re-visit the glimpses of the moon," save in the recital of the scholar, or the conceit of the speculator. Neither church, learning, nor antiquity, could save the System, when it came in contact with the Principle. The conviction in Galileo's bosom was stronger than the Inquisition's seal upon his lips; and one simple result of Newton's induction, swept away the cumbrous lore of ages.

There are few things in history more remarkable than the rapid advancement of science, since it has been emancipated from those toils of the school-men, and based upon actual investigation. It has unveiled facts that far exceed the marvels of fiction; it has stimulated the faculties of man to perform the most stupendous achievements; and it is continually opening wider fields for his conquests. In the confidence of its method, he explores the heights and depths of the universe. He throws his measuring-line across the abysses of the firmament, and paces along its glittering coasts. He descends among the monuments of twilight-epochs, and reads in the labyrinths of the earth fragments of its embalmed history. He takes the

Digitized by Google

bewildering parallax, and finds new tissues of mystery in a drop of water. He weighs planets and analyzes atoms. He separates the subtile filaments of the light. He touches that electric force which throbs through all nature, and, as he touches, it communicates his thought around the globe.

But, notwithstanding all this scope of truth, and all this accuracy of investigation, science is peculiarly exposed to the perils of system. Exciting the thirst of speculation, it generates the vices of theory. Lifting man's mind to giddy heights, he becomes intoxicated. He presumes to sit in judgment upon nature. Having sounded amazing depths, and opened a wide horizon, he thinks he has discovered the seminal principles of the universe, "the vestiges of creation," and unfolded all its plan. Hence the severest induction often involves an assumption that leads to that error of system which we may entitle *the deification of natural law.* The philosopher accumulates materials, and detects in them certain affinities, which unite them in classes. These, again, are gathered into a more comprehensive relationship; until, by and by, he reaches their highest common element, which he styles "a general law." So far as these "general laws" afford a convenient scheme and vocabulary for the study of nature, it is very well. But it is unquestionable that, in our reasonings, we are too apt to let the scientific conception stand for the profoundest truth, to admit these general laws as ultimate facts. We suffer them to usurp the dominion of another Power. We make realities of abstractions, and refer all phenomena to an assumed energy. Thus there creeps in a chilling and irreligious philosophy. We shrink from the idea of supernaturalism. We thrust the notion of intelligent causation into an obscure distance. Between the Deity and his works, we hang a veil of impenetrable materialism. The great cathedral of nature is transformed into a factory. Faith and worship easily vanish out of it, for we consider God as absent from it; and if ever he touched its springs, it was in the stormy twilight of some nebulous epoch — it was by some primitive impulse long ago. We may see the print of his hand, but the breath of his presence is not here. The crucible and the dissecting knife tear and dissolve from

Digitized by Google

nature its beautiful garment of inspiration, and lay it bare as a bleak machine, a ghastly though living skeleton, whose beating heart is the eternal vibration of an unintelligent and causeless force.

Campbell has been criticised for his lines —

> "When science from creation's face
> Enchantment's veil withdraws,
> What lovely visions yield their place,
> To cold material laws; —

but although this is not so in the view afforded us by *true* science, the poet correctly describes the conceptions to which we have just alluded. Upon this ground, too, the irreligious tendencies which some charge to natural science are confirmed. It is the source of that distrust with which new revelations of the physical universe are so commonly received. But this materialism is not the result of science, but of system. Men have stopped short in the question of causation. They have not asked and fathomed the question — "*What is a law of nature?*" "What is *force?*" It is philosophical to ask, it is highly unphilosophical to do otherwise — to ask — what is this power that springs from one deep centre but radiates in a myriad forms; that clothes the universe in beauty, and fills it with life; that spins worlds upon their axles and sustains the tender flower, that shoots in the chrystal, and shimmers in the Aurora, that descends in the snow-flake, and breaks out in thunder. What is it, but an intelligent and infinite Will? It is true that everywhere we find a sublime order, but this is not the lifeless regularity of an automatic universe, but the harmony of a serene and all-controlling Mind. Everywhere we trace the action of unbroken and irresistible law; but let us not be ashamed to rend the veil from our scientific fetichism, and recognize in these "laws of nature" the instant pressure of the Divine Energy.

The tendencies of system in science are also apparent, in endeavors to ascertain *final causes* and *ultimate facts.* It is hardly surprising, when we consider the wonderful adaptations of the universe, that man should try to find out its plan; and that, oppressed by its mysteries, ever opening above and beneath, he should strive, as if by force, to exhaust its meaning and find rest for his thoughts.

Digitized by Google.

But all such attempts are at the expense of truth. We may thus become familiar with one circle or classification of nature, but, outside and inside this, there are other circles that we do not know. We decipher one of its plans, but not all its plans, nor the secret of any. We analyze down to fibres and gases, but lower yet, even in the least grass-blade, there is always a fact that we cannot comprehend. There may be such a thing, too, as a "final cause" in nature, but the knowledge of man has not yet reached it. We can find some great end which the universe unquestionably serves, but, then, this also serves some other end. It receives and imparts. The best we know of the great whole is this — that it is a web of mutual dependencies — an involved scheme — where one result empties into another, and through all whose arteries circulates a a common life. The enormous sun is adjusted to the weed by the wall, and the little leaf has sympathies with Sirius. The man of science has *one* view of nature, and it is a correct one. To him it is a congeries of laws and phenomena. It is a galvanic-battery, an alembic, a gasometer, an orrery. But surely this does not comprehend the whole idea of the universe, or exhaust the intention of its creator. The poet has *another* view of the universe, and it is equally correct with that of the philosopher. To him it is a revelation of ever-varying and inexhaustible symbols. A theatre, where God displays "the possibilities of beauty," where he lavishes the riches of endless suggestion. The poet's view is right — the philosopher's view is right, yet neither comprehends the whole of nature; nor do they both. But we see enough to reject the notion of attaining any thing like a final boundary, or an exhaustive analysis. We may employ hypothesis as a stand-point from which to grasp a solid fact, but if we would convert our scaffolding into the fabric of the universe, our presumption is soon rebuked. We may get up our system, and, for a time, congratulate ourselves that every thing works so nicely in conformity to it; but, presently, some anomaly breaks in and spoils our conceit, drives our conclusions and formulas all into mist, and sweeps away our whole system, landmarks and all. The true inductive philosopher feels this, and therefore forecloses no theory, takes nothing for granted.

Digitized by Google

After all, then, in the prosecution of scientific investigations we must fall back upon a principle. We must consider what is the admitted fact, the solid ground, upon which we fasten the first thread of our induction. That fact is revealed in our own consciousness of an independent Will and a controlling Intelligence. We must study nature not alone in the dry light of reason, but in the glow of religious sentiment. We must stand in that position where a *moral* light falls upon it, illuminating its hieroglyphic beauty with a clear, spiritual significance. We must see it all generalized in God; then we may descend to intellectual formulas and definitions. To begin with the scientific view, is to look through the lens inverted. We thus get only half-truth — facts isolated from the great whole, and the central life of nature. Reason detects a *legal* unity in the several facts of nature, but we cannot interpret their working by any system of physical dynamics. The chain of induction which we so painfully elaborate, link by link, must be charged with the magnetism of faith and love. Then will it be traversed by currents of spiritual life, rending the veil of materialism, and opening the mysteries of the universe.

We now pass to the subject of *Reform.* The whole history of man's political and social progress, has been a struggle of principle with system — of abstract truth with concrete error. In the course of every revolution, the reformer has not only had to encounter the stubborn resistance of established wrong, the opposition or inertia of habit and selfishness, but the reformer has himself been untrue. Men have shrunk from the conclusions of their own premises, or have never had a comprehensive view of those premises. They think they see the principle clearly, adopt it, fight for it, make sacrifices; but when they come to apply it, it strangely dwindles in their hands, does not cover all that it intrinsically comprehends, and becomes contracted into a system. Magna Charta contained great principles, but they were exclusively applied. The Revolutions of 1640 and 1688, did not elevate the crushed mass of the English people. The French Revolution, righteous in many of its elements, and evolving,

Digitized by Google

even now, reforms whose value we cannot easily estimate, degenerated into a war of castes, not a strife for the cause of humanity; grew into a Jacobin mania; and substituted for the tyranny of the few the despotism of the many. The declaration upon which was based our own Revolution, the declaration that "all men are created free and equal," practically carried out, would induce a political millenium. The legitimate operation of that one principle would overturn hoary systems of wrong, smite anointed despotism, break the bondage of the weary and long-oppressed, and ensure the reign of peace and human brotherhood. But it has been applied so narrowly in our own midst, that we need not wonder its influence upon the world has been so feeble. As a principle we have found it too broad, it goes too far, it comes in contact with a system. It is a noble truth for one people, for one caste, but when we attempt to apply it to the humanity that it comprehends, lo! it shrivels — it is denied, it is mocked, by those who, proud of it as a system, are disloyal to it as a principle. We know of no clearer instance of the contrast between system and principle, than that which is exhibited by the Declaration of American Independence, on the one hand, and the institution of American slavery on the other.

Thus social melioration has gone forward by hitches, so to say. It has taken slow ages to elevate, one by one, the sea-marks of human progress, and this, we repeat, not only because of avowed opposition, but because, as Gibbon has sarcastically said, "it has been the first care of every reformer to prevent further reformation." Undoubtedly, our own age will repeat, and, as we see, has repeated the past in this respect. But in no period of the world has the subject of Reform assumed such a prominent and exciting attitude as in the present. Let us, then, briefly consider it in the light of the suggestions which have already been made.

We may observe, as the first thing, that Reform is legitimate. We cannot deny its essential righteousness. But whether we do or not, it is irresistible in its tendencies, and must work on. And it is thus irresistible, because its main current is Providential. It is a fore-ordained proclivity. The conservative may clamor against it, but he

Digitized by Google

might as well clamor against the centrifugal force. He sighs for "the good old times"—he might as well wish the oak back into the acorn. Nor would he retreat, or restore the past, if he could. He would not willingly stand upon that ancient ground which he sees through the stained glass of poetry, and in the light of affectionate veneration. Even he has drifted forward on this silent tide of fate. He is far advanced from the old landmarks. His modest premises would have been grossly radical in the days of his forefathers. His most fanatical toryisms, were common-place axioms to them. Yes, he too has advanced, which shows, as we have said, that this current of reform, that insinuates itself into all things and heaves all things forward, is Providential.

Absolutely considered, then, the *Conservative* is in an abnormal position. He is essentially a man of System. The Reformer, however misguided, has reflected somewhat upon Principles. The Conservative has taken no comprehensive view. He has not looked outside his own associations. If he would not restore the past, he thinks the present is well enough. Here where he rests, is the precise point where progress should cease. The stream of improvement which has accumulated through all ages, should here find its level and its boundary. So he stands upon his island, which, unconsciously to him, is drifting also, and cries out, "Let alone!" "We have gone far enough!" But if there is any argument in this vociferation, it has been valid at any time since the days of Nimrod.

Moreover, the Conservative is not only in the eccentric position of a system. His position is indicated by his little faith. He has little faith in the *truth*. He may boast of his reverence, but he dares not trust that which he believes to the light of scrutiny or the winds of agitation. With him, the form is essential to the thing. He must have the old structure, and rather than disturb it, he would retain its planks and abutments of false institutions. He has but little faith in *man*. He considers him a sort of chained tiger; an essential villain, kept respectable by the law. He is afraid to yield him too much tether, and would not, for the world, precipitate him upon the balance of his moral sense. To be sure, there are classes who,

Digitized by Google

from their position, have a deep interest in the welfare of community; and these may safely be entrusted with power. But these masses, these "unlicked cubs" of civilization, would soon brandish the torch and the knife. He does not consider that these masses are also rooted in the commonwealth, and that if we may trust no latent generosity, we may be sure they will shrink from suicide. But he has his fears. He repeats, what his characteristic progenitors have echoed through all ages, that "There never were such evil times as the present; authority and virtue are denied; and society is breaking up from its foundations." The chief force which he opposes to all this movement, is energy of expression; his heaviest argument is the vocabulary. The zealous reformer is a "Jacobin;" the bold censor is "an atheist." The sympathy of the humane is "morbid sentiment;" the action of the conscientious is "fanatical philanthropy;" and the crisis of all these evils will be "a Reign of Terror!" And when, in some cycle of history, such a crisis does occur — when the sleeping giant rouses, and the bands of an ancient order are sundered like tow — when authority is unsceptered, and law cast down — when, over the judgment seat and the altar, sweeps the smoking tide of blood and conflagration; he points to it, exultingly, as an irresistible confirmation of his theory. But he looks with the indiscrimination of system. He does not consider that this is not the process of reform, but the crash of reaction. These are not men who have been encouraged by a genial confidence, and emancipated by an uplifting love; but men peeled and trampled, galled by the yoke, the whip, and the spur;—lacerated in their affections, abused in their spiritual natures, made carniverous by starvation. The offence has has come; — but wo unto them *by whom* the offence has come! This fierce outrage is *not* practical philanthropy, but it *is* fatal retribution. And are its victims so untainted that the conservative can regard only the cruelty of the avengers? The lintels of those demolished institutions — are they free from blood? Look upon battle-fields, where the bones of men lie like drifted snow — have not multitudes there been dashed in pieces for the anointed few? Have not those harems of courtly iniquity, those shambles of royal lust, shut out the curses, the burning tears,

Digitized by Google

of an insulted and a desecrated humanity? Lay bare that toiling mechanism of sweat and sinews; has it not groaned on through darkness and necessity that the privileged might swim in voluptuousness, and surfeit with crime? And is the diffused selfishness of the *many* more to be dreaded than the *concentrated* selfishness of the *few?* No: we repeat, this is *retribution!* The cup of trembling and abomination that is pressed to the lips of the overthrown, dropped from their own guilty hands. The angry cloud into which the star of freedom stoops and wanes, is an exhalation from long ages of hereditary crime.

Again; as the Conservative has little faith in man, he has no comprehensive trust in *God.* Else he would not fear the coming time; but confide in Him who alone evolves the destinies of the race; who has wrought out this beautiful result of the present, epoch by epoch; who in the most stagnant era has employed, it may be, the most busy agents, silently forming the deposit of an alluvial future; and who, in periods of convulsion, has let the flood and flame destroy no good thing, but, changing and purifying by their stormy force, has built up, in due time, a nobler order.

We have other remarks touching the Conservative, which we have not time to expand. But we would merely suggest that he shows his position as a man of system, also, by his intense *selfishness.* Not seldom the reform which he deprecates troubles not merely his *theory*, but his *interest.* It demands the sacrifice of his ease, his position, his prospects. He argues against it in caucuses, when the *party* is at stake. He weighs its scruples with dollars. He is satisfied with the present — in his easy chair, and after dinner.

Finally; he is a conservative from sheer *will* — downright John Bullism. He wont move! He wont be convinced! He holds on because he sees fit; and with the stubborn tenacity of temper.

But, whatever be the peculiarity of his ultra conservatism, we shall find that it springs from deficiency of principle — broad, deep, inflowing principle. He accuses others of unbelief, when he is himself the greatest infidel. He dreads the sin of license, but considers not the sin of selfishness. He reveres only the saints and heroes of the

Digitized by Google

past; but while he builds the tombs of those whom his fathers slew, he unconsciously satirizes himself.

The Reformer, we said, is, from his position, originally a man of *Principle.* But his action, also, is prone to degenerate into the routine and bigotry of *system.* Those who do not conduct the movement in his way, who do not go through his manual drill, can have no part with him, and are excluded from his sympathies. Those who do not come up to his mark are "*time-servers;*"—those who go beyond it are "*fanatics.*" He who repudiates this ultraism is a "*coward;*"—he who is not conservative upon that point is an "*anarchist.*" So the leaven of system works here, too, and moulds this world-wide principle into a local fact. Each little clique splits into smaller cliques. We see sects of reform, and hear the *cant* of philanthropy. Individualism is a heresy. They who choose to work in the great vineyard of humanity, with hands and thoughts free, with no man's motto on their foreheads, and no man's yoke around their necks, are made alien by advocates of *human brotherhood!* and persecuted under *the law of kindness!*

We cannot linger to specify all, or to describe any of the traits in this Reformer, which expose his subservience to system. One of these is betrayed in his *injustice to the past*, and his *contempt* for it. He acts as if he owed it nothing, although without it he would be bankrupt. But he repudiates the debt. He is as ashamed of the past, as a smart son is of an awkward father. He forgets that his connection with it is vascular — that his own blood flows from it. One might suppose he lived in a planet "got up" and furnished in the nineteenth century. He does not recognise the foot-prints of the mighty who have gone before him. He feels not their magnetic touch throbbing in the pulses of generations, aspiring, toiling, for those results which make up his capital. The ancient wells of inspiration, to his eye, are dried up and moss-grown, not full and fresh yet, green with the dews of heaven, and cool under the shadow of God. The words of wisdom which dropped from the lips of sages, are to him trite and superstitious. The old books are musty. That vivid Hebrew faith was childish. Now this almighty egoism is worse than the conservative's traditional reverence. There

Digitized by Google

are some good traits in that; a yearning over ancestral ashes, a glow of sainted excellence, a sense of God. But irreverence is the emptying from our nature of all true manliness, of all that is genial, of all that ensures permanence for any good sentiment.

Again; this reformer exhibits the vice of system in his *inconsistent scruples.* He strains at a gnat, and swallows a camel. He denies the rules of society, but uses its privileges. He condemns church infallibility, but assumes papal prerogatives. He shows his attachment to system, also, by his *great expectations* and his *conceited claims.* He thinks he has got the catholicon that would immediately heal every social distemper. He forgets that the order of Providence is "unhastening, unresting;" and that its march beats slow through the ages. He assumes, too, that the minority *must* be right, and the majority wrong. He racks his brain to invent some ultraism more extravagant than the extremest, and then admires his own heroism. He *fusilades* every body and every thing with sarcasms, and then considers himself persecuted—a saint not canonized, but cannonaded—an *unbroiled* martyr. We discover his narrowness again by his *virulence.* He hates the thing to be destroyed, more than he loves the thing to be constructed. He often appears animated by a special vindictiveness against some fact or person. It haunts him. He tugs and worries at it like a dog with a root. His philanthropy has no kindly flow. It is always in ebullition. He is perpetually challenging. Sometimes, he fairly spins with passion. Worse than all, he is *unjust.* He sweeps all who belong, by any accident to a class, into the odium that is due only to individuals of that class. And, after all, one of this kind will frequently be a reformer, not from the necessity of duty, but from the current of things. He has an easy sympathy, not a rugged virtue. His philanthropy is flabby. It lacks muscle and symmetry. It is too soft, too sweet. He would cure the world with honey.

Such are the conservative and the reformer, as exhibiting the vices of system. We have presented them in the most extreme light, in order that their radical errors may be clearly seen. In actual life the peculiarities of the two will generally be found mixed; although there are men

Digitized by Google

who stand at a sufficient distance from the medium-line to meet many points of our description.

But in justice to ourselves we cannot close without reiterating what we have already said—that reform is the current of Providence, and the genuine reformer a man of principle. It is his mission to break strong yokes of custom, to open the contracted mind to a more comprehensive vision and to a higher inspiration, to let in upon the false and sordid present the fresh wind of a better epoch. But for all this, he does not depreciate the past, nor exaggerate the future. He is a conservative reformer, a reforming conservative. He knows that the noblest work in the universe, that God's great work, is not to destroy, but to construct. He applies to every thing the test of absolute truth, and enriches himself with the fruits of a wise eclecticism. He does not act merely from the warm impulses of *love*, but with the intellectual discernment and moral stamina of *justice*. He speaks to the wrong-doer not merely by the claims of man, but in the name of the Lord. Hence his words are often edged with a solemn and burning indignation, but are never poisoned by abuse. He has *faith*, too, penetrating as prophesy—comprehensive as the orbit of Providence—firm as the throne of the Almighty. The golden gates of a millennial era are not with him the dream of poetry, but a sure vision. He knows not only how to contend, but how to *suffer*. He has learned, first of all, to reform *himself*, to give up inclination to duty, selfishness to charity, sense to spirit.

Thus armed, let the true reformer persevere. Behind him rises the long train of heroes and martyrs; their faces massive with thought, seamed with conflict; their eyes filled with a dauntless trust; their hands red with the fires of the stake; looking from scaffolds and racks, with apocalyptic vision, far into the future. These acknowledge him as of their lineage, and as doing their work. The work of adjusting perfect principle to a perfect system!

Finally; we wish to say something about system and principle in matters pertaining to religion. We observe, then, in illustration of our theme, that *systems* of error, entrenched in church establishments, or in the pride of self-styled evangelism, venerable by age and by prejudice, engirt with sectarian peculiarity and popular power, strong

Digitized by Google

in learning and endowments, cannot stand before a *principle* of God's own revelation. One fact of His Government or Character is greater than all false creeds. "God is Love," is a sentence more pregnant and mighty than volumes of theology. The advocates of consecrated systems may cavil, and denounce, and cry "heresy," but some Luther, or Wesley, or Murray, fresh from the fields of meditation, and warm with his message of truth, overcomes all the decrees of councils and synods as by the force of inspiration. The hope of growth and progress in the Christian Church rests upon the simple fact that principle is stronger than system.

But the field of illustration which opens to us here is too large to survey at this time, nor can we crowd the end of an article with many specific instances. We will, therefore, confine ourselves, under this head, to the two extremes of *sectarianism* and *unbelief*.

As to *sectarianism*, then, we observe that, in itself, it is not an evil. The truth has been, and must be, advanced by antagonism,—by conflicts and divisions. The conservatism of Orthodoxy, and the ultraism of Heresy, have aided both the discovery and the holding of truth. The idea that each sect represents some truth, and is bearing its fragment towards the construction of a perfect system, is frequently and justly urged. We may also suggest that different sects represent different stages of mental or spiritual developement — certain tones of thought, aspiration and culture. One man finds Christianity most congenial in the bosom of this sect; another, in that. And few can dispute the value of sectarian organization as a rallying point for a great truth, and its necessity for the dissemination of that truth.

But the vice of sectarianism is this. It causes men to forget, in their adherence to a system, the allegiance which they owe to universal truth. It makes them not judges, but advocates—not scholars of Christ, but partisans. However broad the views, however liberal the premises of a sect, it soon grows narrow and bigoted. The zeal of controversy disturbs the calm atmosphere of free-inquiry. Victory becomes of more importance than truth. The sectarian decides not from the high and disinterested ground of principle, but from the peculiar stand-point of

Digitized by Google

system. He dwells upon his particular doctrine until it seems to be the great essential of Christianity—it covers the whole orb of gospel truth, and thus eclipses other doctrines equally important. It is a sad fact that all sects have exhibited this tendency. When they began to form, it was around some fervid, mighty truth, that the world needed, and was longing for, and which, in its original force, shook old error to its centre. But, alas! how soon the stream of inspiration began to vitrify, and the exact, peculiar shape of system succeeded to the life and fluency of principle. This, we repeat, is the history of all sects—Catholic, Protestant, Orthodox, Heretic. Their peculiar facts run into systems, instead of mingling with the great tide of Christian truth as principles. Their adherents become combatants instead of seekers; men of pledged thought and controversial routine, rather than Scripture students, and anxious watchers for still higher revelations of the power, the wisdom, and the goodness of God.

We are anxious not to be misunderstood here. We are not crying out against all controversy. We have already said that it is necessary and effectual. Let it have its place, then, and do its work. We are not warring against sects and sectarian divisions. We suppose that, in the present condition of the Christian world, these must exist. We are not miscalling by the name of toleration, or charity, a silly sentimentalism, or a heartless indifference. No man who loves the truth, or is worthy of it, can be indifferent as to that which he deems right or wrong. But we are opposed to the construction of any system with the idea that it is a complete expression of religious truth. We deprecate the practical influences of such an idea. We do not think it right for any one to hedge himself immovably among sectarian peculiarities; and whatever advantage for the truth he may gain as a member of a sect, we think that his position should be used not as a mere fortification, but as a watch-tower. Much, too, is said, at the present day, and in our own denomination, about "doctrinal preaching," and we have heard some very eloquent appeals made in its behalf. Surely, no man of common sense can doubt the importance and the necessity of doctrinal preaching. No one supposes that we can have action without conviction, faith

Digitized by Google

without hearing, or a consistent practical conduct without an intelligent perception of the principles from which that conduct must ensue. But we apprehend that what may be called a repugnance to doctrinal preaching, is a repugnance to the almost exclusive preaching of one or two doctrines, or an undue devotion to the skeleton of religion, and perhaps even to a few vertebræ. Many people are wearied with mere assault and destruction — or with monotonous affirmation. They would study the whole constellation of Christian truth, and not one or two "bright, particular stars." They would have their moral natures roused, and their practical impulses quickened, as well as their heads enlightened, and their hearts made happy. They would know the method of repentance, and the way of obedience, as well as the doctrine of *final* restoration. They would know and feel the pith and power of an affirmative as well as of an antagonistic faith. Pilgrims in the earth, oppressed by the mysteries of life, thirsting for true, inward peace, they would not only hear of the promised land, but even now lean upon the rock of succor, and taste, in their own experience, the living waters of salvation. Nor should we expect to perpetuate one mode of preaching, or suppose that any truth is equally applicable or necessary under all conditions. The individual and the race are always moving, and as we drift into new latitudes, new lights open in the heaven more immediately over us. We may not need the pole-star less, but we find new glories in the celestial cross. Many, then, who are not opposed to doctrinal preaching, who recognize its value and its importance, are opposed to the incompleteness and monotony of system, and desire the freshness, power, and comprehensiveness of principle.

But we must leave this topic of *sectarianism*, as we have a few words to say upon the subject of *unbelief*. It is to be hoped we have reached that period when simple unbelief has ceased to be evidence of peculiar wickedness. The sentiment which is gradually extending the privilege of the Christian name over wide differences of opinion, is becoming enlightened respecting the grounds of belief. Opinion, so far as it is a matter of the intellect, cannot justly be charged with the sins of the heart. Men are beginning to value the sanctity of free thought too, as

Digitized by Google

well as mere modes of faith. Indeed, there may be more real spiritual life in doubt than in adherence, when such doubt is accompanied by an earnest searching, when such adherence is only the adherence of tradition or indifferentism. In what we have to say, then, at this time, of scepticism or unbelief, we will not condemn it as a *wilful* evil. But we bring a charge against it because of its *partial* character. We condemn not its erroneous conclusions so much as its false premises and narrow disposition.

There are two classes of sceptics. There are those who disbelieve in coarse, ignorant sensualism, and with stolid resistance. To these we do not refer now, for they who do not reason cannot be called assumptive; nor, in their crude, unassimilated materialism, can they be charged with the vice of system. But there is another class, who base their unbelief upon what they term "*severe science.*" They see every thing through a dry and negative intellectuality. In their view, the universe is a machine, defined and self-competent. They ascribe to its laws the functions of creation, and, in the regularity of those laws postpone and deny all action of the Infinite Spirit. They reject every thing transcendental — repudiate the idea of inspiration. Their horizon is perfectly cold and clear. There is nothing mysterious or suggestive in it; not even a cloud for the shapings of imagination, or upon which can linger a ray of hope. The error of the sceptic's position, then, is essentially the error of system. He assumes his premises, and does not re-examine them. He draws every thing to the test of a rigid anti-supernaturalism. Whatever contradicts the natural law of sequence, or outruns human experience, enters the domain of miracle, and therefore, he rejects it. We have not time here to enter upon this question of miracles. But our single remark as to the position of the sceptic in this and other respects is, that it is an assumption. We have no right to set limits to any thing in this wonderful and ample universe. And, as to science, its proper attitude is that of *pupil*, not teacher. It is in transition, not in possession. It is a process of investigation, not a final judgment. While the secret of a leaf is not known; while no man can penetrate the mystery of existence; while revelations of higher truth continually break in upon us; shall we,

Digitized by Google

in the poverty of our knowledge, say what cannot be? Shall we deny those great spiritual laws which throb in our own consciousness? Shall we reject those affirmations of miracle and of immortal life, affirmations to which our best capacities and desires respond, because they contradict our pre-conceived theories, our systematic methods? We repeat, then, the error of the sceptic is the error of system. He lacks a comprehensive principle.

We conclude this article with one remark more. The deepest reservoir of truth is in Christianity, which is so comprehensive and yet so particular; so unchangeable in its essence, and yet adapted to every circumstance. The highest standard of action is Christ himself, whose inner life was a divine fountain of *Principle*, and whose outward conduct, in beautiful correspondence therewith, was a perfect *System* of obedience and love. E. H. C.

Article IV.

Universalism in Europe.

In speaking of Universalism in Europe, our readers must not understand us as to imply a particular sect, organized, there as here, upon the distinctive ground of faith in the salvation of all men; we refer only to a tenet, which, wherever held, is regarded as a part, or article, of Christian doctrine. Except in a few cases, which will be noticed in the proper place, Universalism, as a denomination, is unknown. Those who embrace that belief, on whatever grounds it may be, think no more of making it the subject of a distinctive name, or the boundary-line of fellowship, than any other article of faith, — the divine paternity, original sin, vicarious atonement, endless misery, or such dogmas, on which there are diversities of opinion. They regard it as a part of the Christian system, the ultimate of the grand scheme of redemption

Digitized by Google

wrought out by Jesus Christ. They preach it as an object of faith and hope, a source of comfort in affliction; and draw from it, in connection with other considerations, motives to obedience in preparing the soul for the state of perfection and bliss. But they never labor to make this particular tenet prominent to the exclusion of others equally essential. They do not, however, teach it merely by inference; they make it positive, and adduce direct proofs of its truth; showing, by a fair interpretation of the Scriptures, logical reasoning from the acknowledged attributes of God, and the analogies manifest in all his works, as well as by its peculiar adaptation to the nature and wants of the human soul, that it must be from Heaven.

Wherever the believers have heard of us, as some of them often have done, it has generally been through the false and slanderous representations of the enemies of our faith. From them they have understood that we based our doctrine upon some other foundation than the Prophets and Apostles; that we rejected Jesus Christ as the chief corner-stone, and were infidels in fact, building upon some fancied hypotheses of Nature, an imaginary scheme of Universal salvation which we put forth in derogation of the authority of Revelation. Hence the questions frequently asked, whether the American Universalists believed in God as a spiritual being; in the advent of Jesus Christ; in human responsibility; in the punishment of sin; in the necessity of repentance and faith; in the immortality of the soul; in a future conscious existence; and many others of like character. They have (or had) with few exceptions, no correct knowledge of the principles and grounds of our faith, the numbers who embrace it, or the position we occupy in respect to other denominations. When all those things had been explained to them, it was difficult to make them see the necessity of a separate existence; to understand why we were not retained still in the bosom of the "Reformed Church." They —especially those in France and Germany, had never suffered persecution for believing too strongly in the fulfilment of the promises and purposes of God, and it was difficult for them to see how one class of Christians could treat another as we have been treated, merely for maintaining the doctrines of the Bible, on a certain point, more fully than others.

Digitized by Google

The misrepresentations here alluded to, have had the effect, in some cases, to alienate the sympathies of several distinguished persons who had learned of our existence, and were coming to feel a considerable interest in our condition and prospects. Some, who were in correspondence with us, have been induced to withdraw their confidence, fearing they should be lending their countenance to a disguised Infidelity. The American Universalist feels deeply chagrined that he is compelled to contradict the assertions of his countrymen, and turn apologist for those clergymen who, in ignorance or malice, have falsely accused us and misrepresented our doctrines to those of kindred sentiments in different parts of Europe. It was exceedingly difficult to frame excuses for their conduct. Men of talents, learning, and position, high in the name and praises of the churches, at home, who should be men of veracity, even if lacking in justice and charity, have said to our brethren that we are Infidels; that our profession of faith in Jesus Christ, and the athority of Revelation, is a mere pretension; that we are an obscure sect, composed of men of no character or learning, and almost unknown in this country. To have said that these clergymen were ignorant of the principles of our faith, would have been to accuse ourselves of neglect in not furnishing the necessary statement and defence in a way to afford correct information; which is not true; or else to accuse them of gross indifference, in not informing themselves upon a subject of such vast importance as the final destiny of mankind. In every attempt we meet the same difficulty, for if ignorant, why assert for truth what they did not know? If knowing, why misrepresent us? The professed information was given as correct, and there was no distrust of their honesty; and so we have suffered by their falsehood. It may be well imagined that we were placed in a most delicate position, when, to have stated the truth, would have been to falsify what others had reported of us. And yet no justification could be found for refusing to disabuse the minds which had been misled in reference to our opinions. We had the advantage of being the representative of our own views, and so, without coming into direct competition with travelers who had preceded us, on a question of veracity, we were able,

Digitized by Google

to some extent, to make a fair and full statement of the principles and claims of American Universalism. We apologised for those whose mistatements we were compelled to correct, on the ground that we were, as a denomination, still in our infancy; that these persons knew little of us, other than that our societies had been springing up about the country, and that, in some cases, many of their own flocks had been induced to forsake their former shepherds; and thus they had conceived unfavorable opinions of us and our views; and, without, perhaps, intending us any wrong, had suffered their feelings to warp their judgement, and to color their language. Being, in some measure, unacquainted with us and our doctrines, it could not be expected they would do us full justice. When told that they should not have spoken so positively and unadvisedly where the moral and religious character of a whole denomination was concerned, we could do no more than change the topic of conversation, as soon as possible. National pride forbids the manifestation of any feeling of opposition or hostility towards a countryman; and yet the demands of truth, justice, and charity are broader and deeper than the mere instinct of patriotism.

The same system of misrepresentation has brought back and circulated, in private circles, in public journals, and from the sacred desk, reports unfavorable to the condition of our faith in foreign countries. Everywhere the idea is given out that Universalism is virtually unknown in Europe; that the great men there, learned in theology, critical in exegesis, profound in philosophy, and excellent in morals, generally reject it; that it is confined to a few illiterate men, of little talent and less character, in our own nation. Many serious and liberal men in both countries have been deceived by these fabrications. There are some honorable exceptions to the above remarks; but even where no injustice may have been intended us, we have suffered through lack of knowledge on the part of those who have confessed the extensive prevalence of Universalism in some parts of Europe, especially among the most learned classes in Germany.

It will be the design of the writer, in the present article, to give a general view of Universalism as he found it in

Digitized by Google

the places he visited during the past summer. It will be impossible to offer any thing like statistical information; for there are no data by which a positive calculation can be made. And then it is very difficult to come at all the forms in which the doctrine is held, the method of argumentation and the kinds of proof by which it is defended. To ascertain any thing like positive proof upon these points, it would be necessary to consult each individual and learn his own opinions and his reasons for them. Where there is utmost freedom of thought, and, especially, where there is not the least sacrifice of favor or affection to be made for the widest differences of opinion, unity of faith cannot be expected, till the same degree of knowledge is attained by all. Such liberty is possessed, but not such knowledge, and therefore a great variety of opinions prevails in all the Protestant countries of Europe. We shall, therefore, insist more on the fact of the existence of Universalism, than upon its character and prevalence, though we shall withold no information we possess upon these points. Many who embrace it have no distinct system of evidence by which they advocate its truth. They have been trained up in the belief of it, or grown into it as we have into many opinions we cherish, without knowing the precise process by which the mind has been convinced. But others, and generally all the better informed, have embraced it after a critical and patient investigation of the Holy Scriptures, for, whether Rationalist, Pietist, or Transcendental, it is by them conceded that the doctrine is taught in the Bible; not so much, some think, by direct assertion, as by necessary inference from the plans, purposes, and promises therein revealed. It is also inferred from the character and attributes of God, and is regarded as indispensable to the perfection and glory of his government. Even German Rationalists, contrary to the misrepresentations of some of our countrymen, maintain it on Scripture authority, though they believe it to be equally taught by the united voice of reason and Revelation. Their peculiar and different views of the authority of the Bible, and the mode of interpreting its language, do not, in their judgement, militate against the truth of Universalism. So in England, the doctrine is maintained by Trinitarians and Unitarians, on the ground of election

Digitized by Google

and also of free agency; by those who hold strictly to plenary inspiration, and those who climb up towards transcendentalism; much as it has been, at different periods, in our own country, and as still is, to some extent.

With these prefatory remarks, we shall proceed to our statements, under three heads: Great Britain, Germany, and France. In each of these countries the doctrine is extensively believed, — probably less however, in the former than in either of the others; and in each it is maintained upon grounds somewhat different and peculiar.

Great Britain. The existence of a society in Liverpool professing faith in the salvation of all men, is well known in this country. It is under the pastoral charge of Rev. Dr. D. Thom, who was its founder, and who has been its only preacher. Dr. Thom was formerly a popular and much respected clergyman of the Scotch Church. He is an honest and excellent man. When convinced that the Bible taught the doctrine of Universalism, he made no attempt to disguise his convictions, but openly avowed his belief, and gave the reasons of the hope he cherished. Some were convinced and joined him in the establishment of a new society. He has succeeded in gathering, not a large, but a very respectable society, composed of persons of superior intelligence, and excellent character, who greatly admire and love him. He is a man of strong mind, high moral sentiments, and noble and generous feelings. He has the full assurance of hope. Nothing dismays him. No clouds are so dark that he does not see a bright sky beyond them. He is always cheerful, and, apparently, always happy. He is a studious man. He possesses what may be called a mathematical mind. He reasons logically, and forgets nothing. Times, places, dates, numbers, and the minutiæ of every thing, once understood, are always retained. He feels a lively interest in the welfare of mankind, and is willing to sacrifice all his energies of soul and body, to remove the errors which have so long blinded the judgement and caused men to go astray from God and his truth. But his theological system is a singular composition of opinions, unlike any other ever prevalent in the church. It is pecu-

Digitized by Google

liarly his own, formed after a long, serious, and patient study of the Holy Scriptures. It is not a mere hap-hazard inference from detached portions of the word, without any symmetry or correspondence in its parts; but a deduction from a general meaning which he attaches to the language of Revelation, in many cases *spiritualized*, after the manner of former times. He has succeeded in making his theory intelligible to many persons out of his society, who have embraced it, and rejoice in the hope of the reconciliation of all things to God. Among the number are several clergymen of the Established Church, who, for their living's sake, prefer, yet a little longer, to keep their light in obscurity. They keep up, however, a regular correspondence with Dr. Thom, and manifest the strongest regard for him and his doctrines. There are also several distinguished laymen in different parts of the kingdom, who embrace the doctrine as explained by Dr. Thom; some, however, with many grains of allowance in respect to certain parts of his system. Having seen the falsities of every system which educed the cruel doctrine of endless misery from the government of God, they have been willing to adopt almost any premises and plan of interpretation, by which a conclusion so dishonorable to God, and destructive of human happiness, might be avoided. The theory of Dr. Thom is not attractive, nor easy of comprehension. It is a dark, mystical, subtle theory, requiring much study, and the exercise of a full share of faith. But it embraces the great point of interest, the glory of God and the final happiness of all his offspring. This has made it attractive to thoughtful and benevolent minds, and many rejoice in its light. Among the number may be mentioned Mr. Roe, Mr. Wapshare, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Kent, Mr. Oakshott, Mr. White, Mr. Dabney, Mr. Cowan, Mr. Nicol, Mr. Galloway, and others, not all unknown to fame, in various parts of the kingdom. The name of Mr. Bailey, the author of "Festus," should not be omitted, for he has the faith once delivered to the saints.

Among the popular female writers, the name of Mrs. Sherwood stands pre-eminent, in that country and ours. She is a firm, open, and happy believer in Universalism. During some hours spent with her, most of her conversation was upon that theme, to her of all others the most

Digitized by Google

important and attractive. Her soul seemed to overflow with gratitude to God and love to mankind. She said, she could not be happy without it; she really thought that, if deprived of its consolations, she should be driven to madness. Alluding to the circumstance that her son-in-law, who is a physician, had tried to dissuade her from writing, fearing it might impair her mind, as in the case of Sir Walter Scott, "I apprehend," said she, "no danger on that score. Sir Walter had not the strength of religion, the blessed hope of Universal salvation, to cheer his path and invigorate his mind in his declining years. My mind, sustained by such a faith, can never become weak. It grows stronger every day." Her soul is full of religious feeling, and she will write no work without involving the practical excellencies of Christianity. So faithfully has she done this, that her former publishers object to her later stories, because they are too moral and religious for the English taste; though there is no allusion to her peculiar doctrinal views. They want the naked story without its religious bearings. Hence some of her best works remain unpublished. She was anxious to know what their fate would be if offered to American readers. She is engaged upon a large work on the "Types of Scripture." She said she had just been writing upon "Leaven," and found it a most prolific theme, clearly indicating the salvation of the world, for the "whole was leavened." Her husband assists her in the explanation of Hebrew and Greek words. She has a son who is a clergyman in the Established Church. She has pleaded with him till, she said, "he no longer torments his hearers with the doctrine of endless misery."

The society in Glasgow, to which Neil Douglas formerly preached, still has a name to live, though it is spiritually dead, so far as any information was gained respecting it. There are several believers in that city, and, with the labors of a judicious preacher, would be able to gather a respectable congregation. But there are no laborers in that field.

There are also persons scattered about the realm, in London and other places, who still adhere to the doctrine of Mr. Winchester. Where known, they are called Winchestrians. There is no organized society and no preacher

Digitized by Google

of that doctrine. The society which Mr. Winchester gathered in London, was, after his return to this country, under the charge of Mr. Vidler, who became Unitarian in his views, but retained his position. It is the same society of which the somewhat eccentric political preacher, Mr. Fox, M. P., is still pastor. It can hardly be said to be any longer a religious society, though multitudes assemble there whenever it is known that Mr. Fox is to lecture on some of his favorite political reforms.

But it is to none of these sources that we are to look for the existence of a doctrine corresponding to American Universalism; for, with the exception of the great result, there is hardly any similarity between them, in respect to their doctrines. In hope, in love, in prayers, we wish ever to remain in sympathy with them, and desire an increased knowledge and friendship, which shall be mutual and fraternal.

Unitarianism in England, is more like Universalism in America — it is nearly the same, whether viewed as a whole, or considered in its parts. As a whole, Unitarians reject the trinity, original sin, total depravity, vicarious atonement, special grace, endless misery, and the correlative doctrines. They teach the unity of God, the divine paternity, individual accountability, the adequate punishment of sin, universal redemption by Jesus Christ, and the final salvation of all men from sin and misery. Considered as individuals, they differ, as we do, on some points of doctrine — the inspiration and authority of Scripture, the precise character of Jesus, the time and manner of the ultimate salvation of the race, etc. But these shades of opinion produce no alienation of feeling. They hold to the largest liberty, and reject none from their fellowship, so long as faith in Jesus Christ and the authenticity of Revelation remains.

Unlike the generality of American Unitarians, they are frank, bold and explicit in the avowal of their disbelief in endless misery, and equally open and positive in asserting faith in the salvation of all men. We were able to hear of no exceptions to this remark, and we conversed with many, both of the clergy and of the laity. Many of them expressed their surprise that two denominations, so similar as Universalists and Unitarians in this country, should

Digitized by Google

still maintain separate organizations; that no attempts should be made to amalgamate the two into one large and flourishing sect of liberal Christians, whose united influence would be far more favorable to the extension of knowledge at home and abroad. They professed an equal love for both sects; but some of them were very plain in the expression of their opinion, that they thought us more judicious and manly in the utterance of our real opinions, than the Unitarians were, who hesitate upon the subject. One of their most distinguished preachers remarked that he was able to draw the most forcible arguments in favor of a pure and perfect moral life, and to present the strongest motives to it, from the salvation of all men; for every one, who had that hope in him, would purify himself as he expected to be pure. "Indeed," said he, "I should not know how to preach and enforce morality without it."

Hence, to know what the character and condition of Universalism in Great Britain is, we must study the statistics of Unitarianism, adding the different shades of belief, before described, and searching out still another class of minds scattered among the various denominations. There have been members of the Established Church who embraced the faith of universal restoration; men of high reputation for learning and piety — bishops and prelates, whose writings have borne down to us the evidence of the fact that they rejoiced in the hope of the fulfilment of the promises of God, and the final recovery of the fallen race of Adam. It would be singular if there are none such living in the Church at present. There have also been those in the non-conforming sects who have believed the same doctrine, as their writings testify. Their influence could not die with them. Some of them were men too high in public estimation, to leave no voice to speak after them when dead. It may, therefore, be concluded with safety, that there are, among all sects, those who cherish the hope of Universalism.

Unitarians are not very numerous, but they form a denomination respectable for character and numbers, compared with other dissenters. They have congregations in most of the principal towns in England, a few in Scotland, and several in Ireland. These, all without exception, as before remarked, publicly advocate the doctrine of the salvation of all men by Jesus Christ.

Digitized by Google

Perhaps mention should also be made of some who are not recognized as belonging to any denomination, who make no pretension to a formal religion, and take to themselves no particular name. They are philosophers, statesmen, philanthropists, — Christians without confessing it, whose researches have brought them to adopt the premises which lead to Universalism. They speak of the Universal Father, and of the brotherhood of all mankind. They do not hesitate to advocate the principles of our faith, though, in some cases, they may not foresee, by a living faith, the happy consequences to which they tend. But some are free to confess that all the principles of philosophy, and pleadings of humanity, lead to the conclusion that an All-wise and Omnipotent Being, who is actuated only by goodness, cannot do less than cause truth to triumph over error, virtue over vice, and happiness over misery, so that all rational creatures shall ultimately see and rejoice in the perfection of his just and benevolent government. In that country, as in this, it is *known* there are some of this sort; probably there are many.

Germany. Of the prevalence of Universalism in Germany we have long had some knowledge. With few exceptions, however, our information has come through persons whose feelings and interest moved them to say as little as possible, to keep back all they could, or else present a disguised and partial account of whatever they felt bound to communicate on the subject. Men who will not take the trouble to learn our real sentiments, or be candid enough to represent them fairly, at home, cannot be relied on to search out the opinions of learned and prominent men, in other countries, who are known to favor the doctrine they so religiously contemn. Much less will they be disposed to return such a report as will give confidence and courage to those who espouse a cause they deem, of all others, the most false and pernicious. Neither can it be supposed that they have given a just and honorable account of us, when asked concerning our opinions and character. Few of them, if ever so honest, are qualified to give any thing like a tolerably fair account of our faith and position. Notwithstanding all men feel vastly more liberal and generous when abroad, than when

Digitized by Google

at home, being out of the vitiated and contracting influence of sectarianism and self-interest, it is not to be expected they will think or speak more favorably of what they have always regarded a most pernicious and dangerous heresy, nor of those infatuated persons who advocate it. They may be honest, and mean us no wrong, but they do not know; they have not the capacity to do us justice, to represent us truly. Hence, from them we have learned little that is true of our German brethren, and they still less of us.

Some German books have been imported in which have been found evidences to convince us that Universalism is known and believed in that country. But, as it is a tenet which has never been made, to any great extent, a subject of discussion in the theological controversies which have agitated the religious mind of that country, very little can be found in their writings to favor or disprove it. It is rather treated, *sub silentio*, as a doctrine admitted, than as one to be proved. The opposite dogma is not insisted on as an article of faith, or test of fellowship, and therefore there is no occasion to give it that prominence in the religious investigations which it has occupied in this country. There may be those who still adhere to the doctrine of endless misery, but they are not easily found. A very patient inquiry gave no information of any. In a conversation with a clergyman, chaplain to the Prince of one of the Principalities, a gentleman of superior talents and learning, whose acquaintance with German scholars and doctrines, enabled him to form a very correct opinion of the facts, we could gain no knowledge of any persons who believed or advocated the prominent article of the Orthodox creed of this country. He belonged to the Pietist party, among whom that doctrine is to be looked for, if anywhere; but he had no knowledge of its existence. Neither was he very decided in his convictions of the truth of the better faith. He seemed to treat it as a matter *to be* revealed; as involved in a cloud of mystery, to be cleared up at some future day. He looked upon the duties of the ministry as mostly confined to this world, though a future life was to be taught as an object of hope, to give comfort in sorrow and death. And such is probably the opinion of many of that party in Germany. It is doubted whether

Digitized by Google

any preacher or writer of distinguished ability can be found who maintains the unnatural, irrational, and unscriptural dogma of endless misery.

We have also gained some information by direct correspondence with German Professors. But this has been to a very limited extent. It is exceedingly difficult to create a living interest by the cold formalities of a written correspondence. It needs an intimate personal intercourse, a free and full interchange of thought and feeling, to produce any thing like a confidence and fraternization, necessary to the obtainment of a clear acknowledgment of one's views upon the more intricate subjects of theology. We have been certified of the fact that some distinguished Germans believe in the salvation of all men; but we have all desired more information on that point.

The information we have to communicate was gained mostly from Dr. Paulus of Heidelberg, and Dr. Credner of Giesen; though we had, direct from the lips of others, both clergymen and laymen, a confirmation of the same facts, as well as second-hand, from those who had conversed with men equally distinguished with those named above.

Although the Protestants of Germany are mainly associated as one body, there is a great diversity of opinion, on some subjects, prevailing among them. These regard mostly the authority belonging to the Scriptures, and the mode of their interpretation. There are those who hold to the plenary inspiration of the Bible. Others claim the right to decide what is revelation, and what are interpolations. Others take still larger liberties in the interpretation of the language of the Bible; some viewing no part of it as any more sacred than the writings of any good and truthful men, who are tolerably well informed upon the subjects on which they write. These classes are ranked under various names of Rationalists, Evangelicals, Ultra Rationalists or Transcendentalists, and Pietists. The last two are the most modern, the former being an out-growth of the first, and the latter of the second. With these parties are also associated different modes of action as well as forms of faith. The Pietists are what, among the Episcopalians, would be called Low Church, because they are zealous of the forms and practices of a shadowy piety, a

Digitized by Google

very warm and earnest manifestation of the outward duties of religion. They claim much to themselves, and approach nearer to the exclusives of our country than any others. But they are no more observant of the moral requirements of Christianity, they keep the Sabbath no more holy, and, in short, on a fair examination, give no more proof of deep and abiding religious feeling, than the others. The Evangelicals attach a sacredness to the authority of the Scriptures, much like that felt for the holy Book by liberal Christians in this country. And they explain its language, and enforce its doctrines and precepts, in much the same way. The true Rationalists do not deny the authority of Revelation. They do not invalidate the testimony of history, by exalting the value of their own intuitions. But they take great liberties in deciding what is evidence, what is authority, and what the true meaning and application of the language of the Bible. Dr. Paulus, who is acknowledged the father of this form of Rationalism, professed to me a most profound respect for the authority of the Scriptures, more particularly of the New Testament. He certainly cannot be accused of infidelity, in any true sense of that term. Nor is he answerable, in justice, for any abuse of that liberty he has proclaimed in all scriptural investigations. He has never sought to discredit the authority of the *inspired* word. If any have gone beyond, and wrested it to the destruction of their own faith, the fault is theirs, not his.[1] The Transcendentalists are such as their name indicates, a class who hold to something which rises above, or goes beyond. Those professedly acquainted with their views of Revelation, consider the tendencies of their refined speculations to be directly and inevitably towards Skepticism or Pantheism, by confounding the *objective* and *subjective*, and giving a false preponderance to the latter over the former.

It is a fact worthy of remark that, in all the strength and fervor of the discussion which has been going on, these many years, in the controversies of these parties, the ques-

[1] *Note by the Editor.* It appears to us that Dr. Paulus cannot be so completely exonerated from the charge of having discredited, not only the authority, but even the truth, of the historical parts of the Scriptures. His present position, with respect to these points, may indeed be different; we speak of the ground he formerly occupied.

Digitized by Google

tion of the final destiny of mankind has never been made prominent. And this appears still more surprising to us in America, when it is remembered that the tendency of the general and almost universal sentiment has been to a rejection of the doctrine of endless misery, and a reception of the faith of the world's salvation by Jesus Christ. If any thing like the importance attached to the unmerciful dogma of the infinite punishment of the wicked in hell, by the Orthodox of this country, is maintained by any scholar in Germany capable of giving utterance to his conviction, it is passing strange, that no work has been produced giving prominence to that most valuable article of an "Evangelical" faith. But, on the contrary, not only are their most distinguished men silent upon this point, but most of them are known to believe and to advocate the opposite doctrine. And where it is not asserted, in so many words, it is involved as a natural and necessary consequence from the premises they lay down. Yet nobody is disposed to make an objection, or interpose an argument against them on that account. The acknowledged standard of Orthodoxy is very different there from what it is here.

Dr. Paulus of Heidelberg, who was for a long time at the head of the German schools, a man of superior talents, learning, and piety, still retaining, at the advanced age of eighty-seven, a remarkable degree of mental distinctness and vivacity, informed me that he had long been a Universalist, and that all his investigations tended to confirm him in that belief. Both reason and revelation were as united in declaring that sublime and comforting truth, as they were in teaching the goodness of God, or any other attribute of his nature, or fact of his providence. He said "he did not know a German scholar, of any reputation, who believed in the eternal misery of any of God's children; there might be those who held to that opinion, and still thought themselves wise, but God would show all such that they know not any thing." He is abundantly qualified to form a correct estimation of this subject. He is well known, all over Germany, and has long been in correspondence with the principal scholars. He was intimately acquainted with Goethe, Schiller, and Stilling, as well as the early companion of the most distinguished writers now living.

Digitized by Google

The doctrine of endless misery had been rejected before the old method of explaining the Scriptures was abandoned. In short, few traces of it can be found in any German writings. Universalism has long been considered a plain and necessary inference, a result from the attributes of God. It is based upon his love, and manifested in many ways, especially in the scheme of redemption as revealed in the New Testament. No isolated passages of Scripture, no system of special interpretation, or direct assertion, is needed to prove its truth. The general tenor of Revelation sustains it; and the voice of nature and reason corroborates it. It is indispensable to the perfection of the Divine character and government. Without it, providence and all creation would be a profound and inexplicable absurdity. Every system of philosophy, which men have hitherto considered plain and incontrovertible, would prove to be false; and every form of logic must be abandoned. The nature and capacity of the human soul, even in its lowest debasement, indicates its salvability, and proves its value as an object of Divine compassion. All men are subject to the Divine Will, which is declared to be favorable to their salvation.

Dr. Credner, who is among the most learned and critical students of the Bible in Germany, is well known in this country to be a Universalist. He is open and bold in the avowal of it. He is, by some, reputed to be Rationalistic, by others Evangelical. He is not a Rationalist in the sense in which that term is understood in this country. His views of the authority of Revelation, and the method of interpreting its language, do not differ essentially from those common among the better informed in England and America. He predicates his faith, in a great measure, on what may be called the *harmony of things*. God is one, a unity, the centre and source of all existences. He is infinite and unchangeable, therefore his plans cannot alter, or fail of fulfilment. These plans are clearly indicated in nature, and more so in Revelation, to concern the condition and welfare of all his creatures. Both teach that where his Power is applied, there can be no real imperfection; where his Presence is felt, there can be no positive misery. The apparent imperfection and misery that abound among men, are subject to his control, and de-

Digitized by Google

signed to "work out a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory." The "creature is now made subject to vanity by the will of Him who hath subjected the same in hope." All creation is groaning and travailing in pain, waiting for the adoption. When all things are reconciled to God, and every creature submissive to his authority, the harmony will be declared complete; the Mediator's work will be finished, and God shall be all in all.

In reference to the prevalence of Universalism, Dr. Credner gave it as his opinion that it was general among all those who had any well-formed opinions on the subject. He was inquired of whether the universality was understood to be confined to the atonement, as held by Arminians, in contradistinction from the Calvinistic opinion; or whether it was used with reference to the final destiny of mankind. He said the latter was the more common application of the term, though it originally referred to the mere fact of the universality of the atonement. No doubt it was that point gained, which led to the acknowledgement of the truth of the ultimate salvation of the world.

Professor Tholuck, of Halle, of whose opinions contradictory reports have reached this country, is understood to be favorable to the Pietists, though he is not pledged to any set of opinions. He is a man of excellent spirit and strong sympathies, and is, perhaps, not the most stable of all the German scholars in his opinions. I exceedingly regreted my inability to see him. I called twice at his house for the purpose, but he was absent. Hence I have no positive knowledge upon which to base any assertion of his views of Universalism. But I learned from one who had been some time at Halle, and many times in company with him, that he does believe in the salvation of all men, and hesitates not to avow it, though sometimes in a very guarded manner. His mind has been misled in respect to the opinions and character of American Universalists, by a class of visitors who have carried their ignorance and prejudice across the ocean with them, and made it their business to falsify our views and slander our characters. No language can be too severe in condemnation of such conduct. It is unmanly and wicked. They who have been guilty of it, deserve the severe rebuke, as well

Digitized by Google

as pity, of every true American, — of every sincere Christian. My informant, after a very careful and earnest inquiry into the real opinions of Universalists at home, promised me he would, on his return to Halle, set the Professor right in respect to our denomination. It is, therefore, to be hoped his correspondence with us will be renewed.

This article would be extended beyond its proper limits, should we relate conversations, or even enumerate the names, of those who agree with us in the faith once delivered to the saints. Enough has been said to prove the general prevalence and orthodoxy of Universalism in Germany. But it should be remarked, that the doctrine, there as here, is held differently by different persons; and that different degrees of importance are attached to the public avowal and advocacy of it. Some think the common mind is not prepared to receive it, because wanting in ability to comprehend its principles, and appreciate its merits; that such as did not understand it would take advantage of what would be to them a delusive hope, thinking to be saved while continuing in sin. Others make it prominent, thinking, as we do, that a good desired, and expected, will induce a preparation for its reception and enjoyment. But, as fellowship and character are not affected by its full or partial adoption, or rejection, no public or private controversy is induced, by which the real sentiment of that country is explicitly brought out. There is no need of taking the stand occupied by American Universalists in reference to other denominations. The "Evangelical Alliance" was willing to fellowship Christians without an avowal of faith in the heathen dogma of endless misery. But American sectarists forced it upon them, to cut off all those who are "blessed with faithful Abraham." This fact affords some idea of the different light in which certain doctrines are held in Europe and in America.

France. We have hitherto known very little about Universalism in France. The little work of M. Petit-Pierre, on "Divine Goodness," was translated into English many years ago, and has passed through several editions in this country. But not much was ever known of

Digitized by Google

the author, and nothing of the reception of his work in his own country. It has long been a matter of inquiry whether there were not to be found in the south of France, and west of Switzerland, persons who entertain the faith of Petit-Pierre, in the salvation of all men. No voice has spoken to give us any satisfactory information. We have, indeed, heard considerable lamentation over the doctrinal degeneracy in the region of John Calvin's labors, but nothing sufficiently distinct to enable us to understand the real cause of the complaint. We had also heard of one or two men in France who were supposed to be favorably inclined towards Universalism; and we ventured to appoint, for two or three years, one of them as a Corresponding Secretary of our Historical Society, without, however, having ever heard from him or even sent him a notice of his appointment. When we reflect upon the amount of ignorance which has prevailed in our denomination respecting the condition of our faith in Europe, and especially in France, we should be greatly surprized, was not the cause of it so manifest that nobody can mistake it. But it is singular, notwithstanding, that a large body of the most distinguished clergymen in the Reformed Church of France, a nation so intimately connected with ours, should rejoice in the better faith, and yet we have no knowledge of them nor they of us. But such has been the fact. It is hoped that an acquaintance has been commenced which will afford a large amount of valuable information, and be a source of much satisfaction to them and us, and ripen into a firm and intimate friendship.

That Universalism prevails extensively in France we now have the most positive assurance, and we assert it on the most incontrovertible authority; the testimony of clergymen and laymen occupying the most prominent positions, and possessed of all the means necessary to correct information upon the subject. We were present in the session of the Protestant Synod, lately held in Paris, and became acquainted with several representatives from different parts of the Republic. We were also present, by invitation, at a social *soiree* at the house of Rev. Athanase Coquerel, where we met several members of the Synod. From all with whom we conversed, we received a con-

Digitized by Google

firmation of the agreeable intelligence above stated. There are many believers in this doctrine in nearly all the Protestant churches; but more in the southern departments than in any other part. It is impossible to determine, with any thing like statistical precision, the proportion of believers in Universal Salvation and endless misery, as there has been no occasion to demand a public expression of opinion on those points. The nearest approach to it will be found below, in the account given of some of the proceedings of the Reformed Church in the Synod held in Paris in September last. Those best acquainted with the particular sentiments of the different clergymen and prominent laymen in the church, give it as their opinion that a very large proportion, nearly all the well informed, reject the dogma of endless punishment, and entertain the opposite opinion.

The French maintain Universalism more on the expressed authority of Revelation, than is common in Germany. They have not gone so far in their researches into the Scripture history, nor given to the abstractions of philosophy so much importance in the construction of their theological opinions. They do not, however, discard reason, nor deny the right of exercising it in investigating the authority and meaning of the language of the Bible. As M. Potevin (a lay delegate) said, in the General Assembly, "his profession of faith was very simple, very positive, and very liberal; he believed in God, and in Jesus the Saviour of men; he accepted the Gospels as the rule of his faith, but rejected the commentaries of men as a guide to conscience. Reason and truth are the works of God, and one never contradicts the other."

They give little prominence to this article of faith as a theme of pulpit discussion. They involve, rather than assert it, in their preaching and writings. To the question, why should not a greater prominence be given to a doctrine so intimately connected with the happiness of men here, and their prospects of happiness hereafter, it was replied, that the naked assertion of an abstract truth can avail little, till the mind is prepared to receive and appreciate it; that no course of reasoning nor quotation of Scripture, can establish it and make it practically beneficial, till the principles on which it is based, and the parts

Digitized by Google

of which it is formed, as the completion of a perfect work, the key-stone of an arch, are properly laid down and rightly understood; and then it will appear plain enough, following as a necessary conclusion. The mass of the French people, it is thought, are not well enough informed to receive and appreciate it, if preached, in a way to make it available to a living faith. It is therefore judged advisable to present it in such a manner that all who are capable of understanding it may draw it from their inculcations, for they alone can truly rejoice in its blissful hopes.

The workings of liberal principles, and the controlling influence which they exert in the Reformed Church of France, were very distinctly manifest during the session of the General Assembly of that Church, which commenced in Paris on the 11th of September last, and terminated on the 7th of October. This church, it should be understood, is composed of Protestants of every shade of opinion, who conform to a certain organization agreed on in 1763, under the act of toleration, and the rules decreed by Napoleon in 1801, by which it was recognized in law as a corporate body, and a certain annual stipend paid by government for the support of its ministry; which salary has been continued to the present time. There are, in the church, Lutherans and Calvinists, Trinitarians and Unitarians, Presbyterians, Universalists, and Methodists, Baptists and Pedo-Baptists, and Anabaptists, and men of all the various shades of opinion to be found in England or America. Probably there is more of the spirit and influence of the great and liberal mind of Zuingli, living in the bosom of the church, than of any other of the early Reformers, whose labors conspired to its existence, during the dark and perilous years of its persecution. It was the labors of the great Swiss Reformer which first aroused the French mind to the errors and abominations of the Romish church, and led to the establishment of Protestantism in that country. But the iron courage, indomitable perseverance, and unconquerable ambition of Calvin moulded into form the plastic materials of the early Reformation, and left an impress which is still retained.

In 1762, a general toleration was obtained for the Protestants, partly through the influence of the writings of Montesquieu and Voltaire; and the year following, a

Digitized by Google

general Synod was held, at which an organization of the "Reformed Church of France" was effected. It was not till the Revolution, however, that any Huguenot was permitted to exercise the rights of a citizen, to own lands, or hold any office. Since then, the utmost freedom has been enjoyed, and numerous societies have been established in various parts of the country, which are in a high degree of prosperity. There are now between four and five hundred Pastors harmoniously laboring in the cause of Protestantism against the assumptions of Romanism on one hand, and of infidelity on the other. But no meeting of the church has been held since its organization, till the present season; a period of more than eighty years.

The events of last February, in favor of Republican liberty, seemed to call for a meeting of the General Assembly, and a reorganization of the Reformed church. A preparatory meeting was held in May last, at which a general plan of representation and form of proceeding were agreed on. This action was called for by the circumstances of the church, but more directly by an excellent but modest little pamphlet, written by M. le Pasteur Reville of Dieppe, under the title of "Some Thoughts upon the Organization of the Reformed Church of France." The editor of "Le Lien," the Protestant Journal of Paris, says of this work: "To have so many reasons in so few words is really a rare thing." It contains much excellent sentiment. The writer thinks the gospel has no trace of a definitive constitution of a Christian church, but has left that work to the judgment of those who shall live at different ages and under different circumstances; that Christianity satisfies three faculties, three fundamental tendencies of the human mind, *liberty*, *union*, *progress*, and the end *supreme perfection;* that all organizations which restrict or perplex the natural liberty of the soul are wrong; that the tendency to union is natural to humanity, in all times, in all places, and under all forms; that progress is the law, the end of human nature; Jesus made it the basis of redemption, and called upon his disciples, his *redeemed*, to "be perfect as their Father in heaven is perfect:" men, who remain stationary, resist this law of Christ, and the law of God. The inference to which he arrived, was, that for union and progress the church should be reorganized, not to set limits to human thought and investigation.

Digitized by Google

The General Assembly of September was composed of eighty-nine delegates from the different consistories, elected according to the rules prescribed by the meeting in May. After its organization, the first business of importance which came up for consideration, was a proposition made by M. Agenor de Gasparin, a lay delegate, which was, in substance, that the church should be established upon a dogmatic basis, upon a confession of faith, which it should regard as essential, to be briefly but frankly expressed. He added the threat that, in case his proposition should be rejected, a separation must follow. Many of his friends, he said, who remained in the National church, were waiting for a sign of the will of God to effect a separation; that sign would be found in the refusal to adopt a confession of faith, and they would certainly obey it, and establish a church on a dogmatical basis. Two other propositions were made; one to adopt the Confession of Rochelle, the old creed of the church, which it was admitted on all sides, nobody believed entire; the other was to draw up a declaration of principles, in a formula which all could sign. The main discussion turned upon the question, whether the church would adopt *any creed* as a basis of its organization. This point was debated with great energy and dignity on both sides, for five days, when a final and solemn vote was taken, which decided, by an overwhelming majority altogether unlooked for, that no confession of faith should be adopted. Previous to taking the vote, M. Gasparin renewed his threat that a painful separation must follow the rejection of his proposition, and he asked for prayers that God would give direction and bestow his blessing on the vote. Eighty members voted (nine were absent) each in a distinct voice. Sixty-seven were against a creed, six for it, and seven refused to vote.

This was understood to be a fair test between the self-claimed Orthodox, and the liberal party, in which the former were compelled to adopt a course which has been often condemned in this country. The proposition to fasten a confession of faith of some sort upon the French church, it should be remarked, came from leading Methodists, who were encouraged by emissaries of foreign churches, who are still using their influence to procure a

Digitized by Google

separation of that fraternity which has existed in peace and unity for more than a hundred years, through times of its bloodiest persecutions and greatest prosperity. The Orthodox journals of England, Scotland, and this country, are lamenting the result to which the church arrived. One says: "It remains to be seen whether the minority will really form a Free church, or whether they will still feel themselves at liberty to retain their place among the Establishment." Another says: "The only beneficial result will be a wholesome agitation excited through all the churches, a spirit of inquiry awakened, and the eventual laying of a foundation upon which, by the blessing of a powerful and merciful God, a faithful Reformed Church may be built up again, to the glory of the Lord, and for the salvation of souls." The New York Observer says: "We announce, with the deepest regret, that their labors have not resulted in the establishment of a Protestant church in France upon a basis of evangelical truth," (or a belief in the Trinity and endless misery). Thus, instead of encouraging an endeavor "to keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace," these outside advisers are doing what they can to widen the breach, and rend asunder the hitherto united and prosperous church of France; and this, simply because some are more liberal than others. This appears all the more strange when it is remembered that the disaffected members, who labored so unceasingly to force a confession of faith by majority upon the whole church, are Methodists, the orthodoxy of whose doctrines was strongly denied not many years ago, and themselves treated as the most dangerous heretics. Even M. Gasparin himself declared that he "could not sign the confession of Rochelle, though all its doctrines were expressed in the word of God; it sinned by omission; it mutilated the truth in omitting to put the dogma of human liberty beside that of election." The fact that Calvinists have so recently found out that Arminianism is Evangelical, should admonish them to be careful not to create discord, abroad, on account of faith, while they are toiling so hard for "Alliance" at home. They should also remember that they are quite willing to retain in their bosom persons whose faith in the old creed is very problematical, so long as they say nothing about it, — until they

Digitized by Google

actually denounce it in so many words. The church of France has not been very guilty on this score, for the worst that the Orthodox say of it, is, that it maintains a "system of negatives." It suffers the old creed of Rochelle to rot in secret, as most Orthodox churches in America do the Westminster Catechism, or the Saybrook Platform, and every other creed upon which they nominally rest. But more honestly than they, the French of every shade of opinion frankly acknowledge that they do not believe it true. Our divines dare not say so much. They ask their converts to submit to forms of doctrine they dare not preach.

During the long and animated discussions on the adoption of a confession of faith as the basis of the church, many valuable facts were elicited, which, as well as the final vote, served to establish the truth of what has been before stated, that the Reformed church of France is decidedly liberal, favorable to the opinions maintained by Universalists and Unitarians in this country. It was not necessary to enter into a direct discussion of abstract theories; but they canvassed principles which clearly indicated the sentiments which are cherished. Doctrinal points were involved in the debate, and decided in the main issue, in a manner intelligible to all, while those who would sow discord among brethren, received a proper rebuke.

Among the names worthy to be known in this country, as taking high and liberal ground, we would record the following: Pasteurs Coquerel and son, and Montandon, Paris; Paumier, Rouen; Reville, Dieppe; Paulain, Havre; Durand, Bordeaux; Buisson, Lyons, President of the Assembly; Borrel, of Nimes; Grawitz, Montpelier; Durand, Vallon; Crevillé, Montaubon; Galup, Grateloup; Culman, Bischwiller; Vidal, Bergerac, and several others of equal distinction in the church. Among the laymen M. M. Potevin, Pin; Prof. Sardineaux of the National College at Montaubon; Clausanne, Judge in the Court at Nimes; and Charles Coquerel, of Paris, author of the "History of the Church in the Desert; or the Protestants of France, from the death of Louis XIV. to the Revolution." All these men manifested, during the debate, an excellent spirit, a profound regard for the rights

Digitized by Google

of individuals, liberty of conscience, and the honor of the Christian church. They found no authority for a creed in the Bible, which they took as their directory in matters of faith, and for the authority of which they showed the greatest reverence.[2] Some took occasion to dissent from the Rationalism of Germany, asserting that it was generally unknown in the church. They claimed the right, while they admitted the authority of Revelation, to interpret it according to the light they had, and denied the right of the church to pass a decree by which the orthodoxy of faith should be determined. They claimed that Christianity was founded on a principle, not on a profession, and hence that no rule of faith should measure the terms of fellowship. The doings and decisions of that session[3] have become matter of history, and will henceforth mark an important era in the Protestantism of France.

We would mention especially Mr. A. Coquerel, of Paris, a clergyman of superior talents, and great popularity, as a decided Universalist. He is reputed one of the most eloquent preachers in France. He is also a member of the National Assembly, and was one of the Committee on the Constitution. He is a man of the most unblemished reputation, and kind and affectionate manners, extensively known and greatly beloved. His son is also a clergyman and a Universalist. He is a young man of great promise, possessing a thoroughly educated mind, fine feelings, and uncommon powers of doctrinal research. He resides, at present, in Paris, having been called thither, from a settlement at Nimes, to become a professor in one of the schools, and take charge of a small parish newly organized. Mr. Charles Coquerel, a brother of Athanase, is the editor of the leading literary magazine of Paris, and

[2] *Note by the Editor.* If they maintained this ground honestly and consistently, they took the Bible itself as their creed. In this case, the more correct way to state the question, in debate between the two parties, would have been, "Whether they should adopt any other creed than the Bible?" — not, whether they should adopt a creed; for so much, it appears, they proposed to do.

[3] The regular journal of that session of the Synod of the National Reformed Church, as reported by a committee, is published in "le Lien," the Protestant paper, and it is worthy of a translation and publication in our papers. It discovers much valuable information.

Digitized by Google

distinguished for his literary attainments. He is a Universalist. We would also mention with much respect, M. Paumier, of Rouen, the President of the Consistory. He is a venerable clergyman of great knowledge and discretion, and greatly esteemed in the Reformed Church. Few men display more of the meekness, urbanity and dignity of a sincere and devoted Christian. He has a large and valuable library, which he has thoroughly read. In it he has a copy of Petit-Pierre, the only one of which we gained any knowledge. M. Coquerel had never heard of it. These are mentioned in preference to others, only because we formed a more intimate acquaintance with them, and learned their sentiments more particularly.

There have been no works published in France, of which we have any knowledge, distinctly avowing the doctrine of Universalism. It is involved in some of their writings; in those of M. Coquerel in particular, especially in a sermon entitled "Salvation in all Churches," published in 1840, and in his later work on Christianity. His sermon was published on account of a demonstration made in the Conferences of the Reformed Churches held that year, by the Methodists, who sought to enforce their peculiar notions, which are thus summed up:

"1st. Our doctrines are essentially exclusive, because they alone lead to salvation.

"2ndly. It is blasphemous to contradict those doctrines.

"3dly. The object of the Methodist pastors, and especially of those attached to the 'Evangelical Society,' is to expel from the Reformed Churches those pastors who do not hold their opinions.

"4thly. We will act with the consistories, without the consistories, and in spite of the consistories."

The sermon was designed to allay the fervor of party feeling, and preserve the "unity of the spirit" till they should all come in the "unity of the faith," to the stature of perfect men in Christ. The attempt has not been altogether successful, though it helped to allay for a time the turbulent feelings of all but the avowed sectarists. A full and determined demonstration was made at the meeting of the General Assembly, which received its rebuke as before noticed, and as seen in the following "Declaration" prepared by a committee of eight, and adopted by a vote

Digitized by Google

of seventy-three; seven refusing to vote. It is a valuable document, worthy of preservation in these pages, inasmuch as it gives an insight into the real principles of the National Reformed Church of France. It presents the whole subject in a clear light, and enables us to understand the basis on which that church is founded, which is so broadly denounced by the Orthodox journals of England and America:

"PARIS, September 27, 1848.

"*Dear and well-beloved Brethren in Jesus Christ our Lord:* —From the beginning of their labors, your deputies have satisfied the most sacred of all duties, and the prime want of their own hearts, by prostrating themselves before the Author of all grace, to give him thanks for having repaired the chain of our traditions, and called our church after an interrûption of more than eighty years to deliberate through her representatives, upon her dearest interests. At the same time we have besought him to bless the work to which we have set our hands, that it may be productive of abundant and lasting fruits; and, if it is true, as the Divine Word declares, that, 'the fruit of righteousness is sown in peace,' we have confidence towards God that our prayer hath already been heard, for we have been kept in peace. You yourselves have laid down the course of our proceedings; and we have but obeyed your wishes in taking our stand more especially upon the ground of the Christian life and ecclesiastical organization.

"But thanks be to God, we have not contented ourselves with the attainment of a negative peace; we have happily met each other upon 'the only foundation that can be laid;' that is, 'Jesus Christ and him crucified,' our adorable Redeemer. In him we have found, for every faithful member, as well as for the church collectively, the true source of life, and at the same time, the most perfect of bonds. Without denying the glorious past of our churches, their eminent doctors, their pious martyrs, and the venerable monuments of their faith, we have had no desire to diminish the no less glorious liberty of the children of God asserted by our fathers, or to proclaim any other authority than that of the eternal Word. To us Jesus Christ is at once the bulwark of true liberty, since he it is who makes free and delivers; and the bulwark of the faith, since he is its author and finisher. Let us therefore unite with true Christians of all ages who have confessed his name; we acknowledge him, with joy and love, as our only Master, our only Saviour, our only hope in heaven and on earth, where, 'to him every knee must bow, and every tongue confess that he is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.' We desire no other

Digitized by Google

Mediator than he, no other rule than his word, no other guide than his spirit, no other life than that which he gives us, no other salvation than that of which he is the author; and we bless God, with overflowing hearts, for having 'so loved the world as to give his only Son, that whosoever believeth in him might not perish, but have everlasting life.'

"With these sentiments it is, dear and well-beloved brethren, that we have put our hands to the work of ecclesiastical re-organization which you have confided to us; and with like sentiments it is for you to receive it, in order that it may be effectual and fruitful. The times in which we live are difficult; society totters on all sides upon its shaken foundations; all is passing, all changing, all being renovated around us: but the Word of God abideth firm, and Jesus Christ is still the 'same, yesterday, to-day, and forever; in him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily, and he is able to save them that come unto God by him.' Let us cleave unto this divine deliverer; and embracing him by faith and love, be changed by him into his own divine image. Already under his blessed influence, we have, in the course of our labors, experienced the dispersion of many clouds, the disappearance of many difficulties: may he finish among us and among you the work so happily begun, 'till we all come in the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God, to a perfect man, to the fullness of the measure of the stature of Christ!'

"The visible church, which it is our object to re-construct and improve, is, after all, but the external covering of the kingdom of God upon earth,—that kingdom of which the Saviour hath said that 'it is within us.' In our religious society, there will ever be the spots and imperfections inseparable from our sinful humanity: let it be recognized, at least, in the spirit which animates it, and in the fruits of righteousness, peace and joy, which its divine Head causeth it to bring forth.

"Let us unite in imploring, that our humble labors, made fruitful by the blessing of Him, who in all things giveth the increase, may contribute to this happy result, and be rendered subservient to the progress of truth and charity, to the advancement of the gospel's reign, to the union of the churches and their members, to the sanctification and salvation of every soul.

"In this hope, dear and well-beloved brethren, we offer you in conclusión the cordial salutation of the apostle: The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Spirit, be with you all. Amen."

In conclusion, we would observe that we gained little positive knowledge of Universalism in Switzerland.

Digitized by Google

There are many liberal men among the Protestants, who are known to reject the Trinity and endless misery, and to favor the doctrine of the Divine Unity and Universal Salvation. There are those also who believe and preach the opposite doctrines. These are far from being at agreement in their affections and labors; and, from the agitation now going on, it is hoped that a clearer expression of sentiments will ere long be obtained favorable to the truth. The celebrated School at Lausanne is reputed to be unorthodox by the Orthodox of that country and of this, and the theology of Geneva is spoken of in the same opprobious manner as the Rationalism of Germany. In the discussion at Paris, one said, "If we have not here the Rationalism of Germany, we have the Skepticism of Geneva." It is a singular fact that there is no monument of Calvin at Geneva, no significant memorial of the absolute sway he once bore in the Council of State and Consistory of the Church. And his peculiar doctrines are little more respected than the memory of his acts. But the free and courageous spirit with which he attacked the errors and corruptions of the Church, still lives. The reform which he so manfully sustained, has gone on; and the twilight in which he made a partial discovery of truth, has waxed into a bright and glorious day. The names of some of the Professors at Lausanne, the Editor of a literary journal, and several preachers at Geneva, Neufchatel and other places, were given, who are favorable to the doctrine of Universalism.

W. S. B.

Article V.

Different kinds of Sermonizing.

The intellectual and moral organizations of mankind are various. These varieties of constitution, with diverse modes and degrees of culture, create diversities of taste.

Digitized by Google

And hence the differences in style and method that prevail in the ministry. These differences are suggested by the different mental processes found in the ministry, and demanded by corresponding varieties of taste among the laity. The modern ministry is constituted, in this respect, like the primitive: "having gifts differing according to the grace that is given to us." These diversities of thought and taste are doubtless susceptible of classification and analysis. Such a work, perhaps, might be of service in softening prevalent extremes, and aiding in the formation of a more catholic taste, and the adoption of a style of sermonizing broader and more symmetrical. Though conscious of inability for the thorough performance of such a labor, I shall still attempt, in this article, a partial analysis of the leading tendencies in preaching, and its sources of appeal. I mention,

1. The Argumentative tendency. This is found in men of logical minds, and manifests itself in preaching of a doctrinal character, and appeals mainly to the understanding and the reasoning powers. The mind of this cast, may reason either from a Scriptural or from a philosophic basis. This tendency, in our ministry, generally assumes the former, predicating its conclusions on the declarations of inspired authorities. This is an important element in the ministry. By doctrine, in Christian theology, I mean the elementary truths or principles of Christianity; — those principles that relate to the attributes and government of God, his relation to his creatures, and the consequent motives to obedience.

Without certain great principles of theology, around which to rally, as the motive ideas in religion, no salutary and durable effects could be produced, either upon individual character or the general tone of society. It is vain to attempt the moral elevation of a community, and the conservation of social virtue, without theological principles. As well might there be a world, with verdure, fruits, and foliage, blooming upon its surface, without the primary rocks that underlie the soil. Religious doctrine may be termed the *meat* of theology. It is the bone and sinew of all social morality, and of all depth and solidity of religious character.

And yet there are not wanting those who deprecate all

Digitized by Google

doctrinal preaching; who cannot relish aught that is logical or argumentative, that appeals to the understanding or tasks the powers of thought. This might naturally be expected. It has its analogy in the physical world. There are those who crave no meat, in their diet, and lack the gastric strength for its digestion. And for such weakly people, meat may not be good. Certainly if there is not capacity for its digestion, it cannot strengthen. And yet, to a sound and vigorous constitution, a due proportion of animal food is desirable and useful. Such usually crave it, at least, at one meal, every day. And I apprehend that, to a congregation of sound minds and hearts, whose intellects have not been perverted by feeding on fiction, nor their moral feelings weakened by sipping at the corrupted springs of religious effeminacy, a sound and wholesome doctrinal discourse will be acceptable, even though served up as often as once on every Sabbath.

There are others who never desire to hear any but doctrinal preaching, and who seem to think that the wants of society demand no other. And you will also, perhaps, sometimes find an individual who would be satisfied to feed exclusively on meat. Though one might not utterly starve, with a supply of wholesome meat, yet it is evident that mankind, in general, could not be satisfied with such a diet. Neither is an exclusively animal diet natural or healthful. The system craves bread, and fruits, and vegetables. And besides, the temper and moral feelings would suffer by eating only meat. Those animals which subsist exclusively on flesh, are the most ferocious tribes that roam the forest. Their ferocity procures them their natural aliment, and this kind of aliment stimulates their ferocity. Man's physical nature is analagous, in this respect, to that of other animals. It is said, there was a company of Texans engaged in the recent war with Mexico, who ate nothing but meats; and that they were the most destructive in the American army. Not to linger upon the physical side of this analogy, however, it is quite evident to candid observation, that a people trained under a ministry, exclusively argumentative, will acquire an extremely controversial taste. They will become theological hussars, and wage a war of argument on all they meet. Such a people will generally be found deficient in the practical virtues

Digitized by Google

of Christianity, and unmellowed in spirit, by its softer graces.

Man cannot live on meat alone, any more than "by bread alone." And he who administers to his people only doctrinal discourses, however able they may be, and however upright the preacher's life, will find, in time, that there is a portion of man's nature he has failed to feed. And that is the better part of our nature: the conscience and the devotional affections.

I am here speaking of the exhibition and illustration of bare doctrinal principles, unaccompanied with their practical application to the heart and life. I am aware that doctrine is susceptible of such application; and thus, preaching, which is primarily argumentative, may be made incidentally practical. Doubtless all virtue may be based on doctrinal truths, as motives to right living. But to be always expounding doctrinal ideas, without ever making the practical application, would be as ineffectual, morally, as it would be, in a military point of view, if a band of soldiers were to fill the barrels of their rifles with powder and ball, without ever applying the flint, or the explosive cap, and sending the bullet home to do its execution.

I have said that some men are averse to hearing any but argumentative preaching. These are they whose intellectual natures are excessively logical, and their inclinations controversial. They are uninterested in a sermon unless the speaker *proves* or *refutes* something; and when he dwells upon man's duty toward God, or his fellow-men, or essays to touch the springs of devotion in the soul, their foreheads press the pew. There are also ministers of this cast of mind. Many of them are upright and estimable men. But their ministrations can satisfy only that class of minds moulded like their own. Neither can they answer the higher wants of society. They are able controversialists, successful missionaries, effectual revolutionists; but they cannot be efficient, for a length of time, in the capacity of Christian pastors. Luther's was such a mind. He swept over the Catholic world like a tornado through a forest, shivering the hoary trunks of error, and leveling them with the earth. But it remains for others, differently constituted, like Baxter, Whitefield, and Wes-

Digitized by Google

ley, to imbed the seeds of devotion where the forest had been felled, and make the moral wilderness to blossom as a rose. We have had our Luthers, and their mission has passed away. Not that the Christian world have all embraced our truth. The Calvinistic church still stands strong. So does the Catholic. Yet in both cases, the mission of startling revolutionists is at an end.

Said a man of this exclusively doctrinal taste: "I like a minister who feeds us, in every sermon, with the clear corn." Corn is doubtless good, as an article of nutrition; but there are many who would not be gratified to see the earth one universal cornfield. We like, along with the staff of life, an occasional fruit and flower, for flavor and for fragrance. God has made all these in nature, for the physical happiness of man; and in the teachings of Christianity, he has provided a similar variety for our moral good.

Doctrine, I infer, should be preached, plainly, and frequently, especially in communities like the manufacturing towns of New England, where congregations are composed, in large proportions, of the young. But it should not be preached exclusively.

2. I name, in the second place, the Didactic tendency, which appeals, more prominently, to the conscience and the moral feelings, and aims to reform and regulate the individual life. This practical element in preaching, is equally important with the doctrinal. The fact that many congregations embrace a large proportion of youthful worshippers, which I have made an argument for doctrinal ministration, is an argument equally potent for preceptive discourse. It is, indeed, important that the young should avoid the taint of error and embrace principles of truth. But it is even more important, (could the two be separated,) that they escape the stain of vice, form safe habits, and cultivate pure emotions and elevated affections and desires.

Without the intermixture of wholesome reproof and counsel, in the administration of Christianity, society will go wrong. Such is human nature, that we require line upon line, and precept upon precept, to keep our feet within the narrow path. Such also is the tenor of the New Testament. Though all-important Christian doc-

Digitized by Google

trine is there inculcated, yet the burden both of the Gospels and Epistles, is of a practical character. And these were written when the doctrinal principles of Christianity were, as yet, but little understood, and quite unestablished in the world. They were written, too, by the pioneers of Christianity. And this should be borne in mind by those who argue that there was a time, with us, when the circumstances demanded only controversial preaching. If there is ever such an era, in religious history, it must be of very brief duration. There is a period in the early settlement of a country, when only the axe is demanded, to fell the forest. But that time is short. Unless the spade, or plough, and other implements of culture *immediately* follow, even among the remaining roots of the fallen forest, the families of the settlement will starve before the year expires. And so in religious culture. It is not meet that one whole generation should live and die without bread, feeding only on nuts and acorns, or on wild meats, like John the Baptist, till the ministry of truth shall have felled all the forests in the land. If grain and fruits be not forthwith implanted, there will spring up a second growth of wood, more hard and unyielding than the former. This second growth will be infidelity and irreligion, and there will be spiritual famine. Have we not sometimes found it so, in our own past experience.

A learned commentator has remarked, that Christians, in general, acknowledge the thirteenth chapter of Paul's first Epistle to the Corinthians, to be the most important chapter in the whole New Testament, inasmuch as it unfolds the attributes and practical results of Christian love.[1] But with Universalists, the *fifteenth* chapter of this epistle has been made the most conspicuous, for the clearness with which it treats of the great doctrinal truths of the resurrection, and the salvation of our race from sin and corruption. If we would give the thirteenth chapter the same prominence, in preaching, and in the selection of our texts, that we have given the fifteenth, and which it certainly demands, we should soon be the most exemplary people in Christendom. But the religious world is full of ultraisms, and we have had ours. The whole sermon-

[1] Dr. Adam Clarke.

Digitized by Google

izing capital of some ministers, has consisted of the doctrinal treatises of Whittemore, Balfour, and Ballou. These are excellent works in their line. And these ingots of theological gold have often been drawn into leaf, and spread over a whole ministry, of two years in a place; the minister believing and preaching that all that is necessary for individual salvation, in the present life, is to believe in universal salvation hereafter. A greater sophistry never possessed the human brain.

A prevailing error has been to exhibit truth *as an end;* viewing character, not only as an inevitable result of mental indoctrination, but even as secondary in importance. Doubtless a clear conception of truth inclines one to virtue. So a pure life inclines one to the perception of truth. Said Jesus: "If any man will do his (the Father's) will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God, or whether I speak of myself." There is a connection between truth and virtue. But either, exclusively exhibited, will not always develope the other. Truth is important, aside from virtue, as a source of solace in affliction. But virtue is important, aside from abstract truth, in all life's relations. Doctrinal opinions, limited to the abstract, have no value; while virtue has an intrinsic and immediate worth. The *end* of all sermonizing, therefore, should be practical, even when the process is argumentative or consolatory. The settled pastor need not make this distinctive application in every discourse. If he sometimes confines himself to the exposition of a truth, his general course will imply the application, and save him from misinterpretation. But the pioneer who preaches, perhaps, but one sermon in a given locality, should not leave this end to dubious inference.

3. Another element in the ministry, which demands our notice, is the Reformatory tendency, which appeals to our philanthropy, and seeks to meliorate the customs and institutions of society. I do not here include that fierce radicalism which aims at the destruction of existing institutions. I trust this tendency is not prevalent in the pulpit. Yet benevolent clergymen sometimes seem to mistake their vocation, as the means of individual salvation, and transform the Sabbath and the pulpit into instrumentalities of social revolution and general reform. I

Digitized by Google

am not speaking unfavorably of organizations for general reform, nor against ministers, like other men, taking part, as men, in these philanthropic movements. But such is not, primarily, the office of the pulpit, nor the occasion of the Sabbath. Christianity seeks the salvation, from sin and wrong, of man, individually, as the eventual means of social renovation. Society is made up of individuals. As is the average character of the individuals composing the social mass, so will be the general tone of society. And no general improvement can be effected, any farther than you elevate the average of individual character.

Jesus and the apostles labored, not so directly to meliorate the prevailing institutions and conventional usages of their times, as to reform the individual life. They sought to make the kingdoms of this world the kingdom of God and of his Christ, by the conversion to Christian principles, and the imbuing with the Christian spirit, of the individual subjects of those kingdoms. While they labored, primarily, for individual reform, they labored the more certainly, though remotely, for general improvement. And they took all proper occasions incidentally to disavow existing wrongs, as uncongenial with Christianity, and to show its application to their removal. They gave their sanction to temperance, freedom, and social equality, and raised their voices against the opposite evils. But they did not organize the Christian churches with primary and special reference to these general abuses. They added to the church, of "the saved." They garnered into that repository, those who were individually redeemed, in order to keep them so, while they should still infuse abroad the saving leaven. Our philanthropic organizations have been the riper result of the longer and deeper workings of the principles of Christian fraternity, in the millions of individual hearts. And could they have existed at that period, though Jesus and Paul would probably not have taken supervision of them, I doubt not they would have spoken an encouraging word for them, so far as they were organized and conducted in harmony with the principles and spirit of Christianity. And such, we think, should be the course of the Christian minister at the present day. As a man, he may be a general reformer. But as a minister, he should labor, primarily, to

Digitized by Google

reform the individual lives brought by his position within his influence, taking care neither to sacrifice his influence as an individual reformer, by unnecessarily offending prejudices against general reforms; nor to discountenance general reforms by yielding to those prejudices.

The primary office of the pulpit, is the inculcation of Christian truth and love; and the certain result of the successful inculcation of these, is general melioration. All true reform grows out of Christianity. Christianity contains the elements of all moral light. The pulpit is as the laboratory where is formed the gas that lights up the city; while these reformatory organizations are as the manufactories of the pipe that conveys it through the streets and dwellings. Pervert the laboratory to a pipe-foundery, and the chemist into a lamp-lighter, and the city would soon be dark. Let the minister continue, then, his work of moral chemistry, while the details of the labor may be superintended by others, all working in coöperation, and the more effectually by each one working in his appropriate sphere.

The minister often finds himself placed between the two fires of a stolid conservatism, which remonstrates if he countenances aught that may savor of innovation, and an insane radicalism which clamors, with a dozen Babel tongues, if he does not devote himself and his pulpit, exclusively, to each of as many different reforms. Under these circumstances, it were well if the ministry could choose the safe and sensible medium, and so define its position, that its course might be anticipated. This course, we judge, must lie, like all truth, somewhere inside of fanatical extremes. There is an unphilanthropic piety, and there is an impious philanthropy. Each looks with horror on the other, and both are spurious, and aside from the Christian mark. The former may be symbolized by the old Lombardy poplar, planted upon our shores by our fathers. Like their religion, it towers, as the type of reverence, towards the skies. It runs up like a distaff, tall, and stiff, and prim, its restricted foliage shedding no broad and friendly shadow on the earth, to shelter the weary pilgrim from the noontide sun. The other element is emblemized, rather by the Indian banian tree, that grows to small height, and its branches then dip down

Digitized by Google

into the soil, and become the roots of other stocks that shoot upward, thus forming a continuous grove, overarching the earth with foliage. So this irreverent philanthropy, though ever reaching outward, in a broad regard for man, is still ever tending earthward, in a skeptical philosophy. True Christian character is a medium, typified by the broad and lofty elm, the symbol of a united reverence and humanity. And in such a medium should lie the course of the Christian minister. Primarily laboring for the salvation of individual souls, he should not omit to show the bearing of Christianity on man's social and civil interests. He should kindly recognize, and aid by his influence, those moral and philanthropic movements whose objects and appliances are in unison with Christianity. It is the genius of Christianity to assimilate the institutions of society to its own spirit; not by the process of excision and engrafting, but by that of implanting. While it commends, for the time, obedience to "the powers that be," it silently imbeds, in the individual souls of men, the seeds which, in their prospective germination, shall put forth a power that "shall shake all nations," and turn the hearts of subjects and of rulers, "as the rivers of water are turned."

4. The next that I shall notice, is the Æsthetic tendency, which appeals, principally, to the taste and imagination, through an ornamental style, elaborately embelished with the flowers of literature, and having generally a philosophic basis. This is, perhaps, the most difficult style of sermonizing that prevails. Few men can sustain this mode of discourse, as settled ministers. It requires an extensive and polished education, added to intellectual industry and fine taste. And it is perhaps fortunate for the interests of religion, that this style of ministration is not easy; for a minister who cultivates this, exclusively, will do but little good. There should never be a discourse wholly of this character, delivered in a Christian pulpit, on the Christian Sabbath. It is as inappropriate as would be a firmament all rainbows, or a farm all flower-beds. I mean a sermon of the kind you will sometimes hear:—a mere piece of pulpit embroidery, wrought over a thin ground of questionable philosophy, in the vivid coloring of our parlor literature. You shall hear discourses of this

Digitized by Google

type, which do not impart one theological idea, awaken one religious thought, nor inspire one devout emotion. Such a spiritual repast is like the evening meal of an eminent divine, who ordered his proverbially obstinate spouse, in a somewhat peremptory tone, to prepare for himself and company, "a *light* supper." She arranged on the mahogany table, with damask linen cover, her richest China, cut glass and silver plate, brilliantly illuminated with colored sperm candles, on silver candle-sticks; but without an article of food! This style of preaching is in demand, in certain quarters, principally, it may be presumed, because it is rare, and difficult, and costly. It is in repute, for the same reason as are the sparkling mineral waters of Bath and Saratoga,—not because the majority who resort to them, feel the need of medicine, or have any great confidence in their efficacy; but because of their celebrity, expensiveness, and measurable inaccessibility to the ordinary grades of men.

This style of preaching, besides its general inutility, as a moral instrumentality, is inexpedient, and suicidal to our denominational interests. It is inconsistent with the genius of our fraternal faith, which tends to religious and social equality. We have also a rival who is our superior in this kind of ministration, and whom we shall not be likely soon to equal. And by catering to this taste, we shall impart no cementing principles of faith, while we shall so cultivate this appetite for delicacies, that it will soon discover the more richly stocked refectory that is kept next door, and transfer its patronage. Rev. Mr. Thom, of Liverpool, in his able pamphlet on the question, "Why is Popery Progressing?" gives, as one of the causes of its increase in Great Britain, the fact that the English church retains in her worship just enough of Romish externals to create a desire for more. And as the Romish church, in this respect, far surpasses all others, this taste for exterior grandeur, cultivated in the Protestant establishment, leads churchmen back to Rome. He says, that the Catholic leaders "see with pleasure the importance attached to rites and ceremonies by Protestant establishments, and on this circumstance build their chief hopes of ultimate triumph. Well do they know, that no religion of forms can in point of splendor and attractiveness vie with theirs;

Digitized by Google

and, therefore, where the observation of an inferior ceremonial is enforced, can they be far wrong in supposing, that more than the first step has been taken towards the adoption, at some more convenient season, of the entire Romish ritual?" And precisely the relation which the English church sustains to the Romish, in relation to externals, do we sustain towards another liberal denomination in New England, in regard to a purely æsthetic style of preaching. And the effect of an inferior imitation will prove the same in the one case as in the other.

There are ministers who never put forth any doctrinal ideas, nor dwell upon the practical duties of life, nor the reform movements of the age; but avoiding all that can be exceptionable to the opinions or consciences of their auditors, labor to interest and please by appealing to their perceptions of the beautiful. Young ministers, fresh from colleges and seminaries, often aim at this kind of sermonizing. It is to be feared that men of mere literary taste, without any deep, abiding interest in the religious well-being of society, sometimes resort to the ministry, as a mere temporal resource, by which they may cultivate a genius for fine writing, or graceful elocution, with no ulterior aims at usefulness, and from no motive of duty. Much of the preaching of young ministers, being too exclusively the result of reading, with a deficiency of observation and intercourse with society, is at too great a distance from the auditory to be of any practical utility. It is too ancient and foreign for present use and home consumption.

There are others of an opposite extreme of taste, who view all philosophic modes of thought, and all elevation and ornament of style, as inadmissible in sermonizing. A sermon, to such tastes, instead of a continued bed of roses, must be a plain potato-field; and they would almost object to the blossoms that nature paints upon this vegetable, as a blemish in the landscape. These are Christians of drab-colored minds, who consider it sin or folly for the minister to imitate the bloom and beauty seen in the sermonizing of Deity in the book of nature. They are saints of the Doric order, who reject all carving and fresco, as belonging to the temples of Belial. And there is a corresponding tendency in the ministry, which starves the

Digitized by Google

philosophic and imaginative elements of our nature, driving poetic minds to the greener fields of a more literary ministry.

In a philosophic age, and in an educated community, it is necessary that the minister should know something of science, that he may be able to harmonize the truths of religion with the facts of nature, and thus save scientific minds from skepticism. He should also be acquainted with the literature of his own age and language, and, as far as practicable, with the literature of the past, and of foreign nations, that he may commend the truths and duties of religion to the refined and educated, as well as to the unlearned. The literary character of a sermon, however, should never be the first consideration. The primary feature should be its truth, or precept. And the prominent appeals should be, not to the taste or fancy, but to the understanding, the conscience, and the affections. Rhetorical beauties should not be served up as the centre-dish of the feast, but mingled in, as seasoning, to give flavor to the more solid and nutricious articles. This will make worship, a feast "of fat things, full of marrow," gratifying all undiseased palates, and feeding the intellect and heart. It were well that our ministers were philosophic and literary men; but I would not have them preach mere philosophy nor literature.

We are probably in no danger of immediate ruin from an excessive tendency in this direction. There are some minds in our ministry, deeply colored by a rich æsthetic vein, and who have contributed liberally to enrich our embryo literature, and to elevate the style of our younger ministry, in general. For this we are indebted to them. But our indebtedness, on this score, would be more than cancelled, should their influence result in the abandonment, to any considerable extent, of a doctrinal basis in our ministrations. But we see no cause for serious apprehension of such a result. Any tendency to this, must be limited and temporary. Our people and our ministry would soon be cloyed with the sparkling but vapid waters of æsthetics, as a substitute for the deep wells of a Christian theology, and return to those fountains which alone can satisfy the thirstings of the soul. Neither should we hold these brethren responsible for the "unearthly fluttering" of

Digitized by Google

some of their unfledged imitators, who set up as pulpit *literati*, on the small reading capital of a few annuals and romances.

It is obvious that a person duly organized and balanced in his powers, will combine, in certain just proportions, reason, conscience, benevolence, and taste. And one thus constituted will crave a proportionate intermixture, in sermonizing, of the four elements we have here considered. And such a comprehensive method of discourse will not only feed the well-balanced and symmetrical minds in a congregation; but it will also deal a portion to each of these extremes of taste, to which I have alluded; thus "rightly dividing the word of truth." Each of these kinds of ministration is found in the New Testament. There is argument for the logical, in the Epistles of Paul to the Romans and Corinthians. There are reproof and exhortation all through the Gospels and Epistles. There are the breathings of philanthropy in the principles of the divine paternity and human brotherhood, which Christianity unfolds, and in all the teachings and the life of Christ, as also in the writings of his followers. And there are imagery and beauty, conveying the loftiest and deepest thought in the most glowing and impressive language, in the discourses and parables of Jesus.

Let the Christian volume still be the guide of the Christian minister, in method and style, as it is in doctrine. The truths of Christianity should be shown to harmonize, not only with revelation, but also with sound philosophy and reason, and put forth in an attractive and impressive style. Such a combination of qualities in preaching, will commend religious instruction, at once, to man's whole nature; and the minister who thus shapes his course, adding a warmth and earnestness of spirit, cannot fail of being useful, though he may not be conspicuous.

We could scarcely recommend this broad, symmetrical mode of ministration to those who aim at ministerial prominence. Such a sermonizer, though he may be esteemed as far as he is known, and the more so the longer and more intimately, will be the favorite and idol of but a few. There will be those of broadly-cultivated minds, who are not found in sufficient number, in the community, to build, for a minister, a sectarian popularity.

Digitized by Google

And hence our popular ministers are almost uniformly men whose taste and culture are extreme. One shines as an argumentative, another as a devotional, another as a reformatory, and another as a rhetorical preacher. But no man *shines* as a comprehensive and well proportioned sermonizer. Still we would commend this method, as it is better to be useful than to be eminent, and to be esteemed than to be admired.

5. In regard to the *spirit* of preaching, aside from its style and method, I might allude to the Pathetic tendency, which appeals to our sympathies, by tenderness and pathos; and to the Mirthful tendency, that appeals to the humorous part of our nature, by the display of wit. The latter is of questionable utility, in the pulpit, under any circumstances. Humor is, indeed, an element in our natures, and doubtless designed for good. So, also, of our grosser animal propensities. Yet these cannot well be made the medium of religious influence, in the pulpit. Neither can an appeal to our risible inclinations. Doubtless there is "a time to laugh." But that time is not during the hours of religious worship. It would be viewed by all, as indecorous, in prayer-time, or during the exercise of singing. And is it less so, during the sermon? Those ministers who seek to attract audiences by frequently courting laughter, do not usually sustain the responsibilities of settled pastors, who must reap the consequences of an injudicious course.

I will not say that a Christian congregation may not occasionally be excited to a smile, without disparagement to the effect of worship. There are some incidents in the life of Jesus, which, were they not too familiar, might create a smile. Such are his retort, when accused of casting out devils by Beelzebub; and his expedient to release the woman destined to be stoned. But in these cases, the moral idea still prodominates. And there is no warrant in Christianity, for catering to a light or prurient taste, by exhibitions of the ludicrous, or by indelicate allusions.

The pathetic tendency, which moves to tears, though on many occasions appropriate and salutary, may still be overdone. It is allowable and desirable when the occasion, or the nature of the subject, calls for pathos. But

Digitized by Google

for the preacher to invent occasions for such appeals, and get up fictitious scenes for the obvious purpose of displaying his tragic powers, is unworthy of the pulpit, and will react unfavorably on the moral feelings of the hearers. It requires nice judgment in the use of these elements in preaching. Excitement, either of the tearful or mirthful sympathies, should not be sought, as an end. There is enough of the tragic and the comic in real life. And the office of religion is so to calm and fortify our natures, that we may meet all vicissitudes with comparative equanimity.

6. I might speak, in conclusion, of the Visionary tendency, in the ministry, which appeals to the curiosity and credulity of men, by espousing and advocating all new chimeras. And I should probably be borne out, by the majority of enlightened and practical minds, in classing under the chimerical head Phrenology, Mesmerism, Fourierism, &c.

I would not assume that there is *nothing* in these hypotheses. There is *something* in physiognomy. Lavater's books on this *science*, sold as extensively, in the last century, as have those of Spurzheim, on phrenology, during the present. And who does not often recognize in the aquiline features and compressed expression of the Jew, Shakspeare's Shylock; and in the genuine Yankee merchant, Bryant's "Keen son of trade with eager brow"? So there is something in the theory that determines character by the chirography. Who does not identify the striding autograph of ANDREW JACKSON with the lofty energy of the man; and the bold and open signature of JOHN HANCOCK, with heroism and ingenuousness of character. Granting this, however, it does not follow that these are among the solid sciences; much less that they should be thickly woven into the warp of sermonizing. And this is equally applicable to those other hypotheses, which are of doubtful truth, and of questionable utility if true.

Some congregations have been sufficiently bored, in time past, by the phraseology peculiar to these *sciences*, "falsely so called." They have had grave discourses on the Christian miracles having been wrought by animal magnetism, and in elucidation of a clairvoyant psychol-

Digitized by Google

ogy. They have been treated, on Sundays, to dissertations on the "reorganization of society," with digressions on the "evils of *civilization*." And they have sometimes been taught how the *acquisitiveness* of Judas overcame his *adhesiveness*, till the reaction of his *conscientiousness* excited his self-*destructiveness*. But as this tendency, with the demand, has never been extensive, and as considerable has of late been said upon some of these points, this department of the subject may be passed over.

I am here reminded, however, of a tendency to prolixity, and will therefore draw this article to a close.

L. C. B.

Article VI.

Charles Lamb.

Final Memorials of Charles Lamb. By Thomas Noon Talfourd. 2 vols.

One of the finest characters of this century — we may say of the last eighteen centuries — is, to our thinking, that of the gentle, fantastic, heroic Elia. Ten years ago, when the works of Charles Lamb, to which were "prefixed his Letters, and a sketch of his Life, by Thomas Noon Talfourd, one of his Executors," were republished in this country, we made ourself the owner of a copy, and became at once, not an admirer so much as a lover — not so much the acquaintance as the companion, of this charming writer and most *human* man. The man who can read one of the Essays of Elia and not read them all; who can read them once and not again, and again, is not to be trusted. Like the Bible and the Plays of Shakspeare, they are for all time, and all times. You may read them when you are gay and when you are grave; when you are well and when you are sick; when you are in a hurry and can be tempted by nothing else, and when you

Digitized by Google

are at leisure to tarry at every period, and enjoy, piecemeal, every beauty. His style is the purest and best. He writes nothing, as to manner or matter, that, living or dying, he should wish to blot. He adorns and dignifies and humanizes every thing he touches. He sees good in every thing. He loves, and is loved by, every body. A Liberal in politics, he was on the best of terms with the most incorrigible Tories; a Liberal in religion, he was the friend and correspondent of Churchmen and Presbyterians as well as of Unitarians and Quakers. His opponents, whether in matters of Church or State, never thought the less of him for his opinions. Every body loved him — Coleridge and Godwin, Southey and Leigh Hunt, Wordsworth and Hazlitt, Cary, the "pleasantest of clergymen," and Thelwall; such is the power of a sincere, loving soul! They were all — these opposites, these unsympathizing — all his.

He lived nearly all his days in London; and was never entirely at ease when absent from that great haunt of men. He grew to be a part of it and of them. The country chilled him. A narrow, dingy alley, thronged with men, had, for him, attractions that the country, with all its beauty, could not furnish. In his low chambers in the Temple, the hired clerk of the India House, with his sister, Bridget Elia — you have read "Our Relations?" — was at home. Here, or in its immediate vicinage, was the "beat" of the old Benchers — of Coventry and Samuel Salt, of Peter Pierson and "old Burton"; and here, too, lived before him, and with him, "John Lamb, scrivener, and Elizabeth his wife," the former the Lovell of that exquisite paper on the "old Benchers of the Inner Temple," a man of "incorrigible and losing honesty." Here too the latter played cribbage with Charles, and in the peevishness of dotage told him, when he did not want to play more, "If you won't play with me you might as well not come home at all." Here Charles and Mary prepared — how nicely and cosily — for those Wednesday-evening entertainments, so pleasantly spread before us by Mr. Talfourd. Here the "rapt one of the god-like forehead" discoursed of the "distant and the future," the "prophetic notes of a universal harmony trembling in his voice." Here Priestley was reverently installed, and his doctrine of the finity of

Digitized by Google

sin, and the ultimate happiness of the whole human race, joyously received.

We said the country chilled Lamb; it did not chill him, but the city warmed him. He loved humanity, and all that belonged to humanity. He wrote in 'praise of chimney sweepers,' saying,

"I have a kindly yearning towards these dim specks—poor blots—innocent blacknesses. . . . . I reverence these young Africans of our own growth—these almost clergy imps who *sport their cloth without assumption;* and from their little pulpits (the tops of chimneys) in the nipping air of a December morning, preach a lesson of patience to mankind."

His pleasant friend, Jem White, instituted an annual feast of chimney sweepers, at which it was his pleasure to officiate as host and head waiter, Lamb being always in attendance as assistant-waiter.

He complained of the 'Decay of Beggars in the Metropolis;' not that he was in love with poverty, or liked to see a fellow-creature in want, but that he could not bear a societarian *bellum ad exterminationem* against a whole species."

"They were the oldest and honorablest form of pauperism. Their appeals were to our common nature; less revolting to an ingenuous mind than to be a suppliant to the particular humors or caprice of any fellow-creature, or set of fellow-creatures, parochial or societarian. Theirs were the only rates uninvidious in the levy, ungrudged in the assessment. There was a dignity springing from the very depth of their desolation; as to be naked is to be so much nearer to the being a man than to go in livery."

Though paupers, they were such, but with a difference—there was a distinction between the true pauper and the beggar—"pauperism, pauper, poor man, are expressions of pity, but pity alloyed with contempt. No one properly contemns a beggar;" "poor man reproaches poor man in the streets with impolitic mention of his condition," or ill-timed allusion to his toggery, and Little turns up 's nose at Less; but the beggar,—'no rascally comparative insults him, or thinks of weighing purses with him,'—he stands, as it were, alone. Yet he has his uses—he is not

Digitized by Google

without a 'mission.' Can he be spared from his place and walk? This salutary and touching object to the passers by in a great city — doth he not waken the heart to deeds of charity, to kindly feeling, doth he not call the mind home?

"Reader, do not be frightened at the hard words, imposition, imposture — *give and ask no questions.* Cast thy bread upon the waters. Some have unawares entertained angels. Shut not thy purse-strings always against painted distress. Act a charity sometimes. When a poor creature, (outwardly and visibly such) comes before thee, do not stay to inquire whether the 'seven small children,' in whose name he implores thy assistance have a veritable existence. Rake not into the bowels of unwelcome truth to save a half penny. It is good to believe him."

How graphically he sketches the inconveniences and mortifications men choose to suffer from their "poor relations," and the slights and humiliations *these* must submit to — their desire to be useful, their fear of giving trouble — their diffident familiarity, and offensive diffidence. You may get on with the male poor relative, "but your indigent she-relative is hopeless."

"Her garb is something between a gentlewoman and a beggar, yet the former evidently predominates. She is most provokingly humble, and ostentatiously sensible to her inferiority. He may require to be repressed sometimes — *aliquando sufflaminandus erat* — but there is no raising her. You send her soup at dinner, and she begs to be helped — after the gentlemen. Mr. —— requests the honor of taking wine with her; she hesitates between Port and Madeira, and chooses the former — because he does. She calls the servant *sir;* and insists on not troubling him to hold her plate. The housekeeper patronizes her. The childrens' governess takes upon her to correct her, when she has mistaken the piano for the harpsichord."

If you would see how the weaknesses of human nature can be dignified, read the paper on Capt. Jackson, the retired half-pay officer "with a wife and two grown up daughters, whom he maintained with the port and notions of gentlewomen, upon that slender professional allowance;" and read it, too, if you would learn to make the most of what you have, however small the amount, and be content and happy therewith. He rented a poor tene-

Digitized by Google

ment, (and called it his "cottage on the Bath road,") where he gave cheerful suppers, and in his "magnificent wishes to entertain you, multiplied his means to bounties."

"Wine we had none; nor, except on very rare occasions, spirits; but the sensation of wine was there. Some thin kind of ale I remember—'British beverage,' he would say. 'Push about, my boys;' 'drink to your sweethearts, girls,' at every meagre draught a toast must ensue, or a song; all the forms of good liquor were there, with none of the effects wanting. Shut your eyes and you would swear a capacious bowl of punch was foaming in the centre, with beams of generous Port or Madeira radiating to it from each of the table corners. You got flustered without knowing whence; tipsy upon words; and reeled under the potency of his unperformed bachanalian encouragements."

"He was a juggler, who threw mists before your eyes—you had no time to detect his fallacies. He would say, 'hand me the *silver* sugar tongs;' and before you could discover it was a single spoon, and that *plated*, he would disturb and captivate your imagination by a misnomer of 'the urn' for a tea-kettle; or by calling a homely bench a sofa. Rich men direct you to their furniture, poor ones divert you from it; he neither did one or the other, but by simply assuming that every thing was handsome about him, you were positively at a demur what you did, or did not see, at *the cottage*. With nothing to live on he seemed to live on every thing. He had a stock of wealth in his mind; not that which is properly termed *content*, for in truth he was not to be *contained* at all, but overflowed all bounds by the force of a magnificent self-delusion."

"There is some merit in putting a handsome face on indigent circumstances. . . . . But for a man steeped in poverty up to the lips, to fancy himself all the while chin deep in riches, is a strain of constitutional philosophy, and a mastery over fortune, which was reserved for my old friend, Captain Jackson.!"

In one of his finest essays, he rips up the pretensions of the age to 'gallantry,' and declares,

"I shall believe that this principle actuates our conduct, when I can forget that in the nineteenth century of the era from which we date our civility, we are just beginning to leave off the very frequent practice of whipping females in public, in common with the coarsest male offenders. I shall believe it to be influential, when" (among other signs given,) "I can shut my eyes to the fact that in England women are still occasionally—hanged. I shall believe in it when Dorimant hands a fish wife across the

Digitized by Google

kennel; or assists the apple woman to pick up her wandering fruit, which some unlucky dray has just dissipated. . . . . Or when in polite circles I shall see the same attention paid to age as to youth, to homely features as to handsome, to coarse complexions as to clear; to the woman as she is a woman, not as she is a beauty, a fortune, or a title."

He then proceeds to give us a specimen of genuine gallantry, such as is good to look upon — the sight whereof is a "joy forever."

"Joseph Paice, of Bread street hill, merchant, and one of the directors of the South Sea Company — the same to whom Edwards, the Shakspeare commentator, has addressed a fine sonnet — was the only pattern of consistent gallantry I have met with. He took me under his shelter at an early age, and bestowed some pains upon me. I owe to his precepts and example whatever there is of the man of business (and that is not much) in my composition. It was not his fault that I did not profit more. Though bred a Presbyterian and brought up a merchant, he was the finest gentleman of his time. He had not *one* system of attention to females in the drawing room, and *another* in the shop or at the stall. I do not mean that he made no distinction. But he never lost sight of sex, or overlooked it in the casualties of a disadvantageous situation. I have seen him stand bareheaded — smile if you please — to a poor servant girl while she has been inquiring the way to some street, in such a posture of unforced civility as neither to embarrass her in the acceptance nor himself in the offer, of it. He was no dangler, in the common acceptation of the word, after women; but he reverenced and upheld, in every form in which it came before him, *womanhood*. I have seen him — nay, smile not — tenderly escorting a market woman, whom he had encountered in a shower, exalting his umbrella over her poor basket of fruit, that it might receive no damage, with as much carefulness as if she had been a countess. To the reverend form of female eld he would yield the wall (though it were to an ancient beggar woman) with more ceremony than we can afford to show our grandams. He was the Preux Chevalier of the age; the Sir Calidore, or Sir Tristan, to those who have no Calidores or Tristans to defend them. The roses that had long faded thence, still bloomed for him in those withered and yellow cheeks."

I never could learn that Lamb was really irritated but once, and then it was with his old friend, Southey. Southey was essentially narrow and illiberal. In youth a

Digitized by Google

Radical and Socinian, he became a bitter Tory and fierce Trinitarian. His head was not strong enough to control the sentiments of a heart which was none of the largest; and his heart was unequal to the task of correcting the errors of an acute, but not exceedingly capacious intellect. In an article in the Quarterly Review, for July, 1823, he made use of the following language. "They," (unbelievers,) "may deaden the heart and stupefy the conscience, but they cannot destroy the imaginative faculty. There is a remarkable proof of this in 'Elia's Essays,' *a book which wants only a sounder religious feeling to be as delightful as it is original.*" This cut the gentle Elia to the quick, snd he wrote in his best style, an expostulation which was published in the London Magazine for the October following. How undeserved and unkind he considered this allusion, how keenly he felt the injustice of its terms; yet, how hard it was for him to express any thing like resentment, how the feelings of pain and semi-anger alternated with those of old affection, and how, subdued by the latter, the note of assault was well-nigh changed to the cry for quarter, and from being the injured party, he came to look upon himself as the almost aggressor — the readers of the "letter of Elia to Robert Southey, Esquire," need not be informed. What in this letter we like most, is the manliness with which Lamb stands for his *unevangelical* friends, Hunt and Hazlitt. Though differing with them in opinion on many subjects, he could see and appreciate their many excellent qualities of mind and heart, and scorned to ignore or deny them for the sake of gratifying the spleen of other friends. The idea entertained by Lamb, that the Laureate had alluded to his writings, in the article referred to, that he might the better have an ungenerous thrust at Hunt, gave him peculiar pain. He was not to be whipped out of his friendships; and the thought that he could be deemed capable of renouncing them for no better reason than that they associated him with the objects of ridicule and reproach, grieved him more than to have been the direct recipient of the most unmeasured calumny and abuse. We have only room for the following extracts: —

"In more than one place, if I mistake not, you have been pleased to compliment me at the expense of my companions. I

Digitized by Google

cannot accept your compliments at such a price. The upbraiding a man's poverty naturally makes him look about him, to see whether he be so poor indeed as he is presumed to be. You have put me upon counting my riches. Really, sir, I did not know I was so wealthy in the article of friendships. There is ———, and ———, whom you never heard of, but exemplary characters both, and excellent church-goers; and N., mine and my father's friend for nearly half a century; and the enthusiast for Wordsworth's poetry, ———, a little tainted with Socinianism, it is to be feared, but constant in his attachments, and a capital critic; and ———, a sturdy old Athanasian, so that sets all to rights again; and W. the light, and warm-as-light hearted, Janus of the London; and the translator of Dante, still a curate, modest and amiable C.; and Allan C. the large-headed Scot; and P—r, candid and affectionate as his own poetry; and A—p, Coleridge's friend. and G—n, his more than friend; and Coleridge himself, the same to me still as in those old evenings when we used to sit and speculate (do you remember them, sir?) at our old Salutation tavern, upon Pantisocracy and golden days to come on earth: and W—th, (why, sir, I might drop my rent roll here; such goodly farms and manors have I reckoned up already. In what possessions has not this last name alone estated me! but I will go on,) and M., the noble-minded kinsman, by wedlock, of W—th; and H. C. R., unwearied in the offices of a friend; and Clarkson, almost above the narrowness of that relation, yet condescending not seldom heretofore from the labor of his world-embracing charity to bless my humble roof; and the gall-less and single-minded Dyer; and the high-minded associate of Cook, the veteran colonel, with his lusty heart still sending cartels of defiance to old time; and not least, W. A., the last and steadiest left to me of that little knot of whist-players that used to assemble weekly, for so many years at the Queen's Gate, (you remember them, sir?) and called admiral Burney friend.

I will come to the point at once. I believe you will not make many exceptions to my associates so far. But I have purposely omitted some intimacies, which I do not yet repent of having contracted, with two gentlemen, diametrically opposed to you in principles. You will understand me to allude to the authors of Rimini and of the 'Table Talk.'"

Did our limits permit, we would gladly quote the whole of his kind and discriminating notice of Hunt—but we must must be content with the closing passages:

Digitized by Google

"L. H. is now in Italy; on his departure to which land with much regret I took my leave of him and of his little family — seven of them, six with their mother — and as kind a set of little people (T. H. and all,) as affectionate children as ever blessed a parent. Had you seen them, sir, I think you could not have looked upon them as so many little Jonases — but rather as pledges of the vessel's safety, that was to bear such a freight of love.

"I wish you would read Mr. H.'s lines to that same T. H. 'six years old, during a sickness:' —

'Sleep breaks at last from out thee,
My little patient boy;

(they are to be found in the 47th page of 'Foliage,') — and ask yourself how far they are out of the spirit of Christianity. I have a letter from Italy, received but the other day into which L. H. has put as much heart, and as many friendly yearnings after old associates and native country as I think paper can well hold. It would do you no hurt to give that the perusal also."

When he comes to Hazlitt, the large-as-gentle hearted Charles speaks out the noble man he is. Though H. had for the time, in one of his moods become soured towards Lamb, the latter does not hesitate to say,

"I should belie my own conscience if I said less than that I think W. H. to be, in his natural and healthy state, one of the wisest and finest spirits breathing. So far from being ashamed of that intimacy which was betwixt us, it is my boast that I was able for so many years to preserve it entire."

While no one had fewer resentments, in no one did they die away so kindly. He had forgiven Southey a dozen times, and accused himself without stint, and wished magazine and review at the bottom of the sea, within a month after the publication of his "Letter." "Though he would retract nothing written in defence of his friends, he was ready at once to surrender every resentment of his own," and was the happiest of men when Southey, who understood him thoroughly, wrote him a kind letter, with a 'self-invitation' to come and shake hands.

No one bore reverses and disappointments with better philosophy; when his farce, "Mr. H.," was played at Drury Lane, and, in the language of the theatre, d—d, Lamb, who sat with his sister in the front of the pit, joined

Digitized by Google

with the audience, and "hissed and hooted as loud as any of his neighbors." He wrote a sonnet — the Gipsy's Malison — for a trumpery annual, the Gem — on which he felicitated himself greatly. "Did you see it," he asks Barry Cromwell, "in Blackwood," "curious construction! *elaborata facilitas!*" The editors of the Annual rejected it on the plea that it would *shock all mothers;* and he was told the age would not bear it; this slightly ruffled him, nothing more: — "I exclaimed, 'hang the age, I will write for antiquity.'"

It being our purpose in this article, to present the man rather than the author — to exhibit to our readers "his nice regards of flesh and blood;" (and to this end, it will be noticed, have mainly been our quotations) we may not omit the mention of the single frailty with which his life was marked. It is not to be denied that during a portion of his life he was too much addicted to the use of intoxicating liquors; though never to any thing like the extent at one time represented. "Drinking with him," says his biographer, "except so far as it cooled a feverish thirst, was not a sensual but an intellectual pleasure; it lighted up his fading fancy, enriched his humor, and impelled the struggling thought or beautiful image into day; and perhaps by requiring for him some portion of that allowance which he extended to all human frailties, endeared him the more to those who so often received, and were delighted to bestow it." Still, with all mitigations, it was a fault — one he grievously answered, as his sacrifices in flight — (his removal from London, his refusal at times to see Wordsworth or Southey, or other friends,) that he might avoid the temptation which he feared his power to overcome, abundantly prove.

But those who knew Lamb only through the earlier volumes of Sergeant Talfourd, much as they must have loved, respected and admired him for his amiable and manly qualities, and rare genius, could form but an incomplete estimate of the MAN, Elia. It was not till the publication, a few months ago, of the "Final Memorials" by the author of Ion, that the world became fully acquainted with the greatness and moral beauty of his character.

We all remembered, and thought we knew, the house-

Digitized by Google

keeper, the more than friend and companion of many a long year — the cousin Bridget of that delightful journeying,

"Through the green plains of pleasant Hertfordshire, — "

the genial companion of the shilling gallery, while yet they were small folks and unknown to fame; — but little did we dream, as we enjoyed these recollections which Lamb has made our own, of that dread visitation through which she became the instrument of her mother's death, and the life-long charge of him of later birth, the strong and gentle Charles.

In 1796, Lamb was living with his father, mother and sister in London; he was engaged as a clerk in the India house at a moderate salary; the father had sunk into second childishness; the mother had lost the use of her limbs; the sister who waited upon her parents with untiring and affectionate care, and who sought in her leisure moments to add by needle work to the slender resources of the family, had worn herself down to a state of extreme nervous misery. In Miss Lamb a tendency to insanity had been more than once developed, and in the fall of this year it broke out into a frenzy which on the twenty-second of September proved fatal to her mother. At a coroner's inquest held the next day it appeared, "that while the family were preparing dinner the young lady seized a case-knife lying on the table, and in a menacing manner drove a little girl, her apprentice, round the room. On the calls of her infirm mother to forbear, she renounced her first object, and with loud shrieks approached her parent. The child, by her cries, quickly brought up the landlord of the house, but too late. The dreadful scene presented to him the mother lifeless, pierced to the heart, on a chair, her daughter yet wildly standing over her with her fatal knife, and the old man, her father, weeping by her side."

No mention of the names of the parties was made in any of the journals of the day; and there were till recently but few people, even in London, that had any knowledge of the facts now disclosed. Lamb's instant decision was, that his sister had been an innocent and involuntary agent in the terrible drama; that it had been occasioned by her

Digitized by Google

unwearied attentions to her mother, which seemed to grow as her infirmities increased; that to her, so noble and so good, he would thenceforth devote his life. Oh, how well and gloriously did he perform this self-imposed duty! The story of his sacrificing devotion, of his love "passing the love of women," is the most beautiful in our language. For this poor, gentle sister, subject to ever-recurring fits of madness — that he might watch over and guard her — that he might minister to the mind diseased, he husbanded with painful care their limited resources, banished all dreams of ambition, gave up "all thoughts of love and marriage, and with an income of scarcely more than £100 a year derived from his clerkship, aided for a little while by an old aunt's small annuity, set out on the journey of life at twenty-two years of age, cheerfully, with his beloved companion, endeared to him the more by her strange calamity, and the constant apprehension of a recurrence of the malady which had caused it!" Sergeant Talfourd, alluding to the fact that Lamb himself had been insane, and for a few weeks subjected to restraint, remarks, "the wonder is that amidst all the difficulties, the sorrows and the excitements of his succeeding forty years, it never recurred. Perhaps the true cause of this remarkable exemption — an exemption the more remarkable when his afflictions are considered in association with one single frailty — will be found in the sudden claim made on his moral and intellectual nature by a terrible exigency, and by his generous answer to that claim; so that a life of self-sacrifice was rewarded by the reservation of unclouded reason."

From Lamb's letters to Coleridge about this time we make the following quotations:

"My poor dear, dearest sister, the unhappy and unconscious instrument of the Almighty's judgments on our house, is restored to her senses; to a dreadful sense and recollection of what has past, awful to her mind and impressive (as it must be to the end of life,) but tempered with religious resignation, and the reasonings of a sound judgment, which, in this early stage, knows how to distinguish between a deed committed in a transient fit of frenzy, and the terrible guilt of a mother's murderer.

"I should ill deserve God's blessings, which since the late terrible event, have come down in mercy upon us, if I indulged

Digitized by Google

regret or querulousness. Mary continues serene and cheerful. I have not by me a little letter she wrote to me; for though I see her almost every day, yet we delight to write to one another, for we can scarce see each other but in company with some of the people of the house. I have not the letter by me, but will quote from memory what she wrote in it. 'I have no bad terrifying dreams. At midnight when I happen to awake, the nurse sleeping by the side of me, with the noise of the poor mad people around me, I have no fear. The spirit of my mother seems to descend and smile on me, and bid me live to enjoy the life and reason which the Almighty has given me. I shall see her in heaven; she will then understand me better. My grandmother too, will understand me better, and will then say no more as she used to do, 'Polly, what are those poor, crazy, moythered brains of yours thinking of always?'

"Let me compare my present situation, prospects and state of mind with what they were but two months back—but two months! O, my friend, I am in danger of forgetting the awful lessons then presented to me! Remind me of them; remind me of my duty! Talk seriously with me when you do write! I thank you, from my heart, I thank you, for your solicitude about my sister. She is quite well, but must not, I fear, come to live with us yet a good while."

But she did come to live with him; and except during her seasons of insanity, remained with him to the end of his life. Of these periods of anxiety and gloom, we are informed:—

"The constant impendency of this giant sorrow saddened to 'the Lambs,' even their holidays; as the journey which they both regarded as the relief and charm of the year was frequently followed by a seizure; and when they ventured to take it, a strait waistcoat, carefully packed by Miss Lamb herself, was their constant companion. Sad experience, at last, induced the abandonment of the annual excursion, and Lamb was contented with walks in and near London, during the interval of labor. Miss Lamb experienced, and full well understood the premonitory symptoms of the attack, in restlessness, low fever, and the inability to sleep; and as gently as possible, prepared her brother for the duty he must soon perform; and thus, unless he could stave off the terrible preparation till Sunday, obliged him to ask leave of absence from the office as if for a day's pleasure—a bitter mockery! *On one occasion Mr. Charles Lloyd met them, slowly pacing together a little footpath in Hoxton fields, both weeping bitterly, and found on joining them, that they were taking their solemn way to the accustomed Asylum!*"

Digitized by Google

Some ten years older than Charles, and feeble as her hold on life appeared, it had not occurred to either of them that their "dual loneliness" would be broken by the removal of the younger moiety; yet, so it was — and only after the interval of long years, nearly eleven, was

"the double tree,
With two collateral stems sprung from one root,"

reunited, never to be severed more. Lamb was greatly indebted to his sister, as he was always proud to acknowledge; he always "wrote and spoke of her as his wiser self; his generous benefactress, of whose protecting care he was scarcely worthy." In 1805 he writes to Miss Wordsworth:

"To say all that I know of her, would be more than I think any body could believe or understand; and when I hope to have her well again with me, it would be sinning against her feelings to go about to praise her; for I can conceal nothing that I do from her. She is older, and wiser, and better than I, and all my wretched imperfections I cover to myself, by resolutely thinking on her goodness. She would share life and death, heaven and hell with me. She lives but for me; and I know I have been wasting and teasing her life for five years past, incessantly, with my cursed ways of going on. But even in this upbraiding of myself, I am offending against her, for I know that she has cleaved to me for better or for worse; and if the balance has been against her hitherto, it 'was a noble trade.'"

Miss Lamb was a woman of superior powers of mind, and of great strength of character. She wrote, jointly with her brother, the "Tales from Shakspeare," and some other works; her portions of which, Charles always insisted were the best. We are told by Sergeant Talfourd, that she

"Would have been remarkable for the sweetness of her disposition, the clearness of her understanding, and the gentle wisdom of all her acts and words, even if these qualities had not been presented in marvellous contrast with the distraction under which she suffered for weeks, latterly for months, every year. There was no tinge of insanity discernible in her manner to the most observant eye; not even in those distressful periods when the premonitory symptoms had apprised her of its approach, and she was making preparations for seclusion. In all its essential

Digitized by Google

sweetness, her character was like her brother's; while, by a temper more placid, a spirit of enjoyment more serene, she was enabled to guide, to counsel, and to cheer him; and to protect him on the verge of the mysterious calamity, from the depths of which she rose so often unruffled to his side. To a friend in any difficulty she was the most comfortable of advisers, the wisest of consolers. Hazlitt used to say, that he never met with a woman who could reason, and had met with only one thoroughly reasonable—the sole exception being Mary Lamb."

It was only after her decease in 1847, that Mr. Sergeant Talfourd felt at liberty to present the world with these full and complete memorials of Charles and Mary Lamb—memorials of facts and incidents which lend to their lives an elevation and a power, which we know not where else, in the record of many centuries, to find. The quaint humorist, the man of quips and quidities, the incomparable essayest, the genial companion, the faithful and enduring friend—stands before us—thanks to his elegant and fitting biographer—the strong minded, well balanced man of the world, and the moral Hero. In the great exigencies of his distressful drama, we find that he acted with cool judgment, and with wonderful promptitude and energy. He managed his pecuniary affairs with skill and prudence; and no temptations could induce him to exceed his income. "He had always a reserve for poor Mary's periods of seclusion, and something in hand beside, for a friend in need." He would seek out "occasions of devoting part of his surplus to those of his friends whom he believed it would really serve, and almost forced loans, or gifts in the disguise of loans, upon them." "Let any one," says Sergeant T., "who has been induced to regard Lamb as a poor, slight, excitable and excited being, consider that such acts as these were not infrequent; that he exercised hospitality of a substantial kind, without stint, all his life; that he spared no expense for the comfort of his sister—*there* only lavish; and that he died leaving sufficient to accomplish all his wishes for his survivors; and think what the sturdy quality of his goodness must have been amidst all the heart-aches and head-aches of his life—and ask the virtue which has been supported by strong nerves, whether it has often produced any good to match it. I. W.

Digitized by Google

Article VII.

Literary Notices.

1. The History of England, from the Accession of James II. By Thomas Babington Macaulay. Volume I. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers. 1849.

The eager expectation of the whole reading community is at length relieved. The intense hunger of the literary public, which was excited by the announcement, some months since, that Macaulay's History was in press, and which has been whetted and tantalized by delay, is now partially appeased. All novel-readers have become historical students. The romance of fiction has less attraction, at present, than the romance of fact; and we should not be astonished if the general absorption of society in one book alone, foreclosed, even for some weeks, the demand for the last productions of Dumas and James.

It is hardly necessary to mention the characteristics of the book. Every one acquainted with Macaulay's manner, knows what to expect, and will not be disappointed. The style, though the same in structure and prominent features with that of his essays, is a little more severe, and pitched on a lower key; while there is less of that flippancy and *nonchalance* with which, in some of the reviews, he was accustomed to gibbet an author, and settle questions which have been for centuries in dispute. But every page of the first volume of the History is distinguished by that omniscience within the sphere of his subject, which Macaulay's writings always suggest; by continual precision of expression which evinces the clearness of his thought; by wit, which constantly vivifies, though seldom prominent; by antitheses as easy as they are brilliant; and by periods which, though they seem elaborately negligent in their construction, possess a rhythm that fascinates the ear. Notwithstanding its seeming simplicity, if we examine a few paragraphs of Macaulay's writing, we shall find that it is as stately as Gibbon's, while its ease and purity may convince us that there will be another Gibbon before there will be another Macaulay.

Guizot's criticism, that English authors are far inferior to the French in the arrangement and *form* of their literary productions,

Digitized by Google

does not touch this History. Its architecture is admirable. Nothing can exceed the graceful art of the grouping, the propriety of the proportions, and the dexterous management of collateral trains of narrative, so that the story seems to be ever advancing. Selections are so made, that all the facts of any weight seem to be given; the perspective is perfect; and the transitions, which always betray the bungler, or reveal the artist, are arranged with consummate grace.

As a History of England, Macaulay's work will be distinguished for the clearness with which it unfolds the progressive changes or evolutions of the English Constitution, the growth of English liberty, and the influence and character of the great English statesmen who have been at the helm of government. For portraiture of character, the book is unrivalled. With a method and philosophy the opposite of Carlyle's, Macaulay's pictures are as clear as any in "the French Revolution," or "Past and Present." He is no abstractionist. The philosophy of the History is not in separate chapters of dry moralising, but the causes which underlie the movements which his pages trace, are suggested in his narratives of the personal fortunes of ministers and statesmen; and thus the interest of a drama enlivens and invests the progress of abstract truth. We shall look in vain for any more fascinating story and more instructive philosophy than can be found elegantly blended in the accounts of the character and fortunes of the Puritans, the rise, traits, and influence of Cromwell's government, and the career of the whig party towards the close of Charles the Second's reign.

No one can help feeling either, that Macaulay is sternly impartial. He judges men in the light of universal moral laws, and of the customs and influences of the time, and happily mingles both elements in his judicial code. He seems to appreciate, too, the distinctive peculiarities of men. We cannot help seeing how hearty is his admiration for the tough character, and vigorous genius of Cromwell, despite his errors, and how slight his liking for the polished, shallow, political purity of a man like Temple. But we must stop. Every body will read Macaulay's first volume, and desire that the Messrs. Harpers be very speedy in the publication of the second. K.

2. The Number and Names of the Apocalyptic Beasts: with an Explanation and Application. In Two Parts. Part I: The Number and Names. By David Thom, Ph. D., A. M., Heidelberg, Minister of Bold Street Chapel, Liverpool. London: H. K. Lewis, 15, Gower Street, North. Liverpool: George Philip. 1848. 8vo. pp. 398.

To such as are curious to see all the hypotheses, calculations and guesses, that have ever been published by the wise, the fool-

Digitized by Google

ish, or the monomaniac, concerning the beasts mentioned in Rev. 13th, we recommend this work of Dr. Thom's. It is by far the fullest collection of the kind we have seen or heard of, and probably surpasses in this respect every other work that has appeared in any language. To prepare it, he must have gone over a wide extent of reading in English and Latin literature on the book of Revelation; and he has succeeded, as nearly, we think, as any one will ever succed, to exhaust all past and present speculation, concerning the number and name of the beasts. It is remarkable with what patience he has not only explored the field, but also unfolded and examined the innumerable solutions that ingenuity or stupidity have proposed. The perfect candor of the critic, and his generous desire to do every inventor full justice, and to set his conjecture in favorable light, are no less admirable. He seems to have a respectful sympathy for all thinkers he meets with, whether they be dull, fantastic, or rational; they still are men who mean well, and as such, he honors them with a hearty regard, which we wish that we ourselves could always feel. At times, however, his own humor is excited by the utter whimsicality of the examples he has gathered. "I cannot," says he, "quit these conjectures without expressing my surprise at not having met with one which appears to me sufficiently obvious. I do not say that the guess does not occur somewhere. Only, I have not fallen in with it. It is founded on the fact of *s* being the sibilant, or hissing letter of the alphabet. In Hebrew, Greek, (not in the beginning of the word, to be sure, which is guttural, but in the word itself,) Latin, English, and many other languages, the word *six*, in its simple form, and in its multiples by tens, etc., involves the hissing sound of *s*. But the hiss is the characteristic sound of the serpent. And in *six hundred and sixty-six*, in many languages, we have the *s*, with its sputtering, hissing sound, assailing the ear in a triple, intense, and concentrated force. Considering these things, how happens it that the genius who suggested the three lilies of the French arms, or he who multiplied the six heads by the ten horns, and these again by ten crowns, or some other of the same stamp, did not suspect, in these three sixes, an allusion to the Old Serpent, and to the exercise of his baleful and malignant influence in the Church?"

This Part I., which is all that has yet been published, is occupied chiefly with the hypotheses of others, and with the author's *critiques* upon them. We think it cannot fail to do an important service; it will cure rational men of the folly of inventing special solutions of the number and name of the Apocalyptic beasts. For, such a mess of absurdities, we suppose was never before brought together. And though the most of them, when taken

Digitized by Google

singly, are laughable enough, yet when they are all set in one vast constellation of oddities, each casting its ludicrous light on the others, in ever multiplying reflections, even gravity itself has to yield. We have seen a single face which was a temptation to one's risibility; but think of a dense congregation of such faces! It is true that Dr. Thom has closed the list with a new solution of his own; but of this we must forbear to express an opinion, since its demonstration is reserved for the second Part, which he proposes to publish in another volume, should leisure and means be afforded. Meanwhile, we thank him for the rich collection which he has now presented us.

3. The Planetary and Stellar Worlds: a Popular Exhibition of the great Discoveries and Theories of Modern Astronomy. In a series of Lectures. By O. M. Mitchell, A. M., Director of the Cincinnati Observatory. New York: Baker & Scribner, &c. 1848. 12mo. pp. 336.

A very respectable work on this most interesting subject. With none of the eloquence and stirring spirit of Nichol, the author presents, in a plain and intelligible description, the appearance of the starry heavens, the apparently complex motions of the planetary bodies, the history of astronomical discovery from the earliest ages to the present, the philosophy of the laws of motion and gravitation which have been ascertained, and the theory of the stellar universe as it is now understood by scientific men. The whole is illustrated by a set of astronomical plates, several of which are copied, we should think, from those of Nichol.

4. Poems by John G. Whittier illustrated by H. Billings, &c. &c. Boston: Benjamin B. Mussey & Co. 1849. 8vo. pp. 384.

We gave a notice of this publication in our last number. At present, we have room only to say, that it has since appeared, in a splendid volume, the mechanical execution of which is equal to that of any illustrated edition of our Poets. From the tone of the commendations which we have seen in different periodicals, we judge that justice, though long delayed, is likely to be done to the extraordinary power of Whittier's genius. The reader, of true taste, will find that he excels in natural beauty, as much as in power.

5. A Fable for Critics: or a Glance at a few of our Literary Progenies, &c. &c. G. P. Putnam, Broadway. 12mo. pp. 80.

We give only an abstract of the whimsical title-page of this *jeu d' esprit*. The Fable is well worth reading for the *critiques*

Digitized by Google

it contains on several of our popular writers, as well as for the wit and humor of the harlequin verse. There are several very happy "hits;" and this, perhaps, is about all that the author aimed at effecting, — not holding himself bound to render a sound and true judgment in every case.

Article VIII.

Religious and Ecclesiastical Affairs.

We have thought for some time of giving our readers, occasionally, in a condensed form, a statement of the operations and expenditures of the various religious organizations in our land. It may be useful, perhaps, in several ways; showing the immense and sustained efforts of the individual and combined denominations in propagating Christianity as they understand it; illustrating the power of a regular system in such operations, and the usual success of a persevering zeal; and enforcing upon Universalists the necessity, and revealing the promise, of a similar steady zeal and and mutual effort and co-operation. It is really a noble sight, the never doubting faith and ever ready and generous self-sacrifice with which the members of the various so-called Evangelical sects pursue the work of distributing the Bible, Books, Tracts, etc.; with which they send out their missionaries and agents, and the cheerfulness with which these go, to the destitute of our own land, and to the heathen tribes of Africa, Asia, and the Pacific Isles. However much we may criticise their theology, no fair-minded man can deny them the credit of earnest convictions, and unwearied zeal in carrying them forward, at whatever cost of money and toil, to practical results.

We propose to note down here a few facts illustrating these points, hoping they will be both interesting and instructive to our readers; who, without doubt, desire to know what is going on without, as well as within, our own denomination. To the account of the ecclesiastical bodies and operations in our country, we shall append a notice of the principal theological Reviews, as they come to hand.

Digitized by Google

I. Statistics of the Principal Christian Denominations in the United States.

1. Presbyterian, (Old School:) Ministers, 1713; Members, 179,453. (New School:) Ministers, 1551; Members, 155,000.

2. Congregational, (Orthodox:) Ministers, 1612; Members, 193,093.

3. Dutch Reformed: Ministers, 289; Members, 32,840.

4. German Reformed: Ministers, 803; Members, 69,750.

5. Lutheran: Ministers, 598; Members, 149,625.

6. Unitarians: Ministers, 250; Members, 30,000.

7. Chris-tians: Ministers, 782; Members, 35,000.

8. Universalists: Ministers, about 650; Members, (not reported,) Societies, about 1000; Population, probably about 700,000.

9. Campbellite Baptists, and Free-Will Baptists, etc.: Ministers, 2700; Members, 300,000.

10. Cumberland, and other Irregular, Presbyterians: Ministers, 1000; Members, 140,000.

11. Methodist Episcopal, (North:) Ministers, 3716; Members, 629,660. Domestic Missions: Missionaries, 358; Members, 30,500. Foreign Missionaries, 49; Members, 1,139. Receipts in the year for Missions, $82,600.34; expenditures, $87,835.50.

Methodist Episcopal, (South:) Ministers, 1500; Members, 465,553. No missions reported.

12. Baptists: Ministers, 4752; Members, 664,566. Foreign Missions: Missionaries and Assistants, 263; Members, 10,020. Receipts, in the year, for missions, $86,226.00; expenditures, $81,834.53.

13. Protestant Episcopal: Ministers, 1505, including 30 bishops; Communicants, 72,099; Population about 2,000,000. Domestic Missions; Missionaries, 102. Receipts, therefor, in the year, $28,638.90; expenditures, $29,743.36. Foreign Missions: Missionaries, 7, and 34 Assistants. Receipts therefor in the year, $40,814.48; expenditures, $40,018.94.

14. Roman Catholic: Priests, 917; Members, 1,190,700. A large sum is yearly raised and expended in propagating the Catholic religion.

II. Statistics of Associations for Religious purposes.

1. The American Bible Society, (supported by all denominations:) Receipts in the year, $254,377.00. In the year, 655,036 Bibles and Testaments have been issued, in different languages.

2. The American Tract Society, at N. Y.: Receipts in the year, $235,659.15; expenditures, $237,155.95. The American Tract Society at Boston received, in the year, $43,000.00; and

Digitized by Google

expended $42,000.00, of which $26,000.00 were paid to the Society at N. Y., making $252,659.00 received by both Societies.

3. The American Sunday School Union: Receipts in the year, $137,468.18.

N. B.—The American Tract Society, and the American Sunday School Union, are supported by the united patronage of Presbyterians, Orthodox Congregationalists and Baptists, Episcopalians and Methodists.

4. The American Home Missionary Society, (supported by Presbyterians and Orthodox Congregationalists,) received, in the year, $140,479.89; and expended $139,233.34. Missionaries, 1006.

5. The American Education Society, (supported by Presbyterians and Orthodox Congregationalists,) received, in the year, $18,099.53; and expended $19,151.52. It has 27 Auxiliary or Branch Societies; and has assisted, during the year, in educating 392 young men for the ministry.

6. The Massachusetts Home Missionary Society: It receives and expends annually about $25,000.00; gives aid to 55 ministers and societies within the State; and pays $18,000.00 over to the American Home Missionary Society. (*Orthodox Congregationalist.*)

7. The American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions: Receipts, in the year, $255,056.46; expenditures, $282-330.38; Missionaries, 394 Americans, and 139 Natives; Communicants, 25,939; Printing offices, 11; Type Foundries, 7. Their schools contain 12,000 scholars, besides several thousands in the Sandwich Islands, where the natives support their schools.

8. The Massachusetts Sabbath School Society: Receipts, in the year, $26,261.82; expenditures, $26,200.00. Reported 325 schools, with 6,303 teachers, 48,815 scholars, and 82,296 vols. in libraries. But these returns are imperfect, as many of the schools neglect to make reports.

III. Contents of the principal Theological Reviews, etc., with the omission of such articles as are of no general interest.

1. *The Christian Examiner*, etc. Jan., 1849. 1. The Crisis of Freedom in the Old World and the New,—in which Dr. Dewey has pointed out the signs of the times, and the apparent tendency of things. 2. Scotus Erigena,—a brief notice of his Philosophico-Theological System. It seems he was not a Pantheist, as he has been represented by some. 3. Alexander's Isaiah,—valuable suggestions on the genuineness of the latter chapters of Isaiah, as well as of the former. 4. Mrs. Somerville's Physical Geography. 5. Neander's Life of Christ. 6. Church Music. 7. Merry-Mount,— a pleasant review of that work. 8. Mount-

Digitized by Google

ford's Euthanasy. 9. Peabody's (Rev. W. O. B.) Sermons. 10. Notices of Books. 11. Intelligence, Religious and Literary.

2. *The Biblical Repository*, etc. Jan., 1849. 1. On the Blasphemy against the Holy Ghost—not important. 2. On Baptism, or the signification of some Greek words translated baptize. 3. On our Age—common-place. 4. On Finney's Theology,—showing some acuteness on the subjects of the Will, Moral Depravity, and Regeneration. 5. Analysis of Eccelesiastes,—arbitrary. 6. Schleiermacher's Religious Views,—that piety is "feeling;" though feeling presupposes knowledge, and results in action, (translated from the German.)

3. *The Methodist Quarterly Review.* Jan., 1849. 1. The Lord's Day, the Christian Sabbath,—a repetition of the usual arguments that our Sunday is the ancient Sabbath transferred to the first day of the week; with the usual oversight of giving the practice of the primitive Christians without their views. 2. The Literature of Politics,—or a plan for reporting, in a logical synopsis, the debates of legislative bodies,—valuable. 3. Channing,—a noble tribute to the memory of that great and good man. We commend it to all our readers. 4. What is the meaning of "Sheol?"—an arbitrary mingling of philological criticism with the old vulgar expositions,—weak. 5. The Progressive Principles of Language and Style,—philosophical, and worthy of consideration. 6. Rev. E. Irving. 7. Thomas Carlyle,—not remarkable. 8. Dr. Paley's Plagiarism,—of his "Natural Theology," from Nieuwentyt of Holland. 9. Religious Intelligence. 10. Literary Intelligence. On the whole, a valuable No.

4. *The Christian Review.* Jan., 1849. 1. Import of Baptism: or signification of some Greek words translated baptize; in review of the controversy between Drs. Beecher and Carson. 2. The Infinity of God developed in the Incarnation and Humiliation of Christ,—a speculation from some of the Trinitarian points of view. 3. Rev. John Foster and his Reviewers,—written in the spirit of profound admiration, and, on the whole, with liberal indulgence to Foster for his Universalism. 4. Antecedent Probability that the New Testament contains some Model of Ecclesiastical Polity. 5. The Extension of Slavery,—an able argument, and a stong appeal, against the atrocious projects that threaten to cover our country with shame. 6. The Life and Times of Rev. Isaac Backus,—the venerable Baptist pastor of Middleborough. 7. Literary Notices.

Digitized by Google

Article IX.

Deductions from the Unitarian Idea of Christ.

Perhaps there are few particulars within the whole domain of speculative theology, in which the common mind is more fully confirmed, than in the subordination of Christ to the Father. Even that portion of the religious community, it is believed, by whom the doctrine of the Trinity is technically retained, scarcely think of the Messiah as God himself. In their seasons of meditation, when their creeds, and the philosophy of their faith, are quite out of mind, and the heart, true to itself, presents the first-blush phase of truth, their conscious thought is Unitarian. It may well be questioned, whether the doctrine that Christ is God, would ever have gained assent, but for the necessities of a system. So plain are the teachings of Scripture in this regard, that such a conclusion seems inevitable. The Scriptures always make a distinction between Christ and the Father. Christ himself disclaims those attributes which belong to God, and in various ways acknowledges the superiority of God.[1] He receives his commission from him;[2] derives his power and doctrine from him;[3] and becomes, by the decree of the Father, the appointed "heir of all things."[4] He professes ignorance of some things known to the Father;[5] disclaims the possession of underived goodness;[6] and, by frequent prayer, acknowledges his dependence on God.[7] And though Christ is called God in a few instances in the New Testa-

[1] The following are among the names applied to Christ:—Man (John i. 30); Son (John vi. 40); Servant (Isa. xlii. 1); Son of God (John x. 36); Minister (Rom. xv. 8); Mediator (Heb. viii. 6); High Priest (Heb. v. 10). Christ is said to be inspired (John iii. 34); sanctified (John x. 36); chosen (Matt. xii. 18); anointed (Heb. i. 9); appointed (Heb. iii. 1 and 2).

[2] Matt. x. 40. [3] Matt. xxviii, 18, and John xvii. 8. [4] Heb. i. 2.

[5] Mark xiii. 32. [6] Mark x. 18.

[7] Matt. xiv. 23, xxvi. 26, 27, 36, 39, 42, and 44.

Digitized by Google

ment Scriptures, yet in some of those instances the application of the term, in whatsoever sense it is used, is wholly unauthorized—as when the Jews said to Jesus, "For a good work we stone thee not; but for blasphemy, and because thou, being a man, makest thyself God"[8]—and in the other instances, it can hardly be regarded difficult of explanation. The numerical phase of this argument is not entirely unworthy of consideration. The number of times the term God is applied to Christ in the New Testament, does not exceed thirteen; while it is applied to divine messengers, magistrates, heathen deities, and used as an epithet for abstract qualities, more than twenty times. But that these applications of the term are departures from its general use, seems manifest, without a specific examination, from the fact that it is applied to the Father, in the New Testament, one thousand three hundred and twenty-six times.[9]

There are a few scriptures which, by a most extraordinary interpretation, are made to yield apparent support to the doctrine that Christ is God. Such is the declaration, "I and my Father are one."[10] But however conclusively this scripture may prove Jesus and the Father to be one, in some sense, it is equally conclusive proof, that, in another sense, they are not one. The very terms of the passage, "I and my Father," not only indicate two distinct personages, but present them under such relation to each other—that of Father and Son—as absolutely to preclude such a oneness as the doctrine of the Trinity assumes. The question in controversy, then, is not whether Christ and the Father are one in some sense; but whether they are one in such a sense as must confound our simplest modes of thought. It is whether we must adopt a method of interpretation which violates the fundamental principles of common sense.

But it is no part of my purpose, at the present time, to enter upon the general argument for the doctrine of Christ's subordination to the Father. So plainly does the general aspect of the Scriptures sustain this view, that but for the necessities of a system, as before remarked, the

[8] John x. 33. [9] See Wilson's Illustrations of Unitarianism, p. 36.
[10] John x. 30.

Digitized by Google

contrary position would never have gained assent. When one proposition has been admitted as truth, another follows of necessity; and thereupon another, until a system is completed. Thenceforward the interpretation of Scripture, though undertaken in the utmost sincerity and candor, can hardly fail to be essentially influenced by what the interpreter has already come to regard as truth. Hence there is a family likeness in all the parts of the several leading theological systems. As the anatomist can define the whole physical economy of an unknown animal from the examination of a single bone or tooth, so the theologian can read out the theological system of an unknown individual from a single vital proposition. This is affirmed, of course, only of those whose theological views have been matured. Many individuals, educated in a given system, have come to reject some particulars of that system, but have not qualified the remainder of their views, as such rejection legitimately demands. This, it is believed, is especially the case with many who have rejected the doctrine of the Trinity. They feel—and I think the number who feel thus, even among the adherents of the various popular systems, is very large—that the Scripture teachings in relation to the subordination of Christ to the Father, are tolerably plain, and on the whole quite conclusive. But here they rest. They have not dreamed that this point will change the whole cast of their theology.

In the present paper, I propose to assume the doctrine of Christ's subordination to the Father, in opposition to the Trinitarian assumption, and proceed to show some of its bearings upon other, and seemingly independent, items of faith.

I. In the first place, then, I remark that this hypothesis necessitates a modification of the Calvinistic view of the atonement. This view supposes men to have been subjected to an inexorable law, of which the penalty is eternal death. Our first parents, the covenanted head of the race, transgressed the law, and entailed its curse upon all their posterity. Inheriting Adam's corruption, the race is supposed to inherit his liability to absolute and irretrievable ruin. But God was unwilling that the noblest of his works should be thus wrested from his grasp by the enemy

Digitized by Google

of all righteousness, without making one effort for man's recovery. That recovery, however, was impossible, unless an atonement could be made for sin. Justice must be fully satisfied. The law must have its full demands. Unless, therefore, some one could be found who would consent to take man's place, and by suffering the penalty of the law, satisfy the demands of justice, there could be no salvation for the race. But neither man nor angel was competent to this work. None less than a very God would be able to suffer all the terrible penalty of that most rigorous law. As a last resort, therefore, Deity himself undertook the work of atonement. He became incarnate, and by his death satisfied his own justice, thus making it possible for man to be saved. The following extracts from acknowledged authorities, sufficiently sustain the foregoing representation.

"Adam's sin kindled the dreadful flame of the divine wrath against the whole human race. . . . . As the spiritual life of Adam consisted in a union to his Maker, so an alienation from him was the death of his soul. Nor is it surprising that he ruined his posterity by his defection, which has perverted the whole order of nature in heaven and earth. . . . . Our nature is so totally vitiated and depraved, we are on account of this very corruption considered as justly condemned in the sight of God, to whom nothing is acceptable but righteousness, innocence, and purity. And this liableness to punishment arises not from the delinquency of another: for when it is said that the sin of Adam renders us obnoxious to the divine judgment, it is not to be understood as if we, though innocent, were undeservedly loaded with the guilt of his sin; but because we are all subject to a curse, in consequence of his transgression, he is therefore said to have involved us in guilt. Nevertheless we derive from him, not only the punishment, but also the pollution to which the punishment is justly due."[11]

Speaking of man's inability to do any thing towards salvation, Calvin says:

"Let us hold this then as an undoubted truth which no opposition can shake; that the mind of man is so com-

[11] Calvin's Institutes, Book 2. Chap. 1.

Digitized by Google

pletely alienated from the righteousness of God, that it conceives, desires, and undertakes every thing that is impious, perverse, base, impure, and flagitious; that his heart is so thoroughly infected by the poison of sin, that it cannot produce any thing but what is corrupt; and that if at any time men do any thing apparently good, yet the mind always remains involved in hypocrisy and fallacious obliquity, and the heart enslaved by its inward perverseness." [12]

"The Scriptures teach that man was alienated from God, by sin, an heir of wrath, obnoxious to the penalty of eternal death, excluded from all hope of salvation, a total stranger to the divine blessing, a slave to Satan, a captive under the yoke of sin, and, in a word, condemned to, and already involved in, a horrible destruction; that in this situation, Christ interposed as an intercessor; that he has received and suffered in his own person the punishment, which, by the righteous judgment of God, impended over all sinners; that by his blood he has expiated those crimes which rendered them odious to God; that by this expiation God the Father has been satisfied and duly atoned; that by this intercessor his wrath has been appeased; that this is the foundation of peace between God and men; and that this is the bond of his benevolence towards them." [13]

"On this righteous person was inflicted the punishment which belonged to us. . . . . This is our absolution, that the guilt, which made us obnoxious to punishment, is transferred to the person of the Son of God. For we need particularly to remember this satisfaction, that we may not spend our whole lives in terror and anxiety, as though we were pursued by the righteous vengeance of God, which the Son of God has transferred to himself." [14]

"It is impossible for the life which is presented by the mercy of God, to be embraced by our hearts with sufficient ardor, or received with becoming gratitude, unless we have been previously terrified and distressed with the fear of the divine wrath, and the horror of eternal death." [15]

"It was the doctrine of Christ crucified they stumbled

[12] Calvin's Institutes, Book 2. Chap. 6. [13] Book 2. Chap. 16. [14] Ib. [15] Ib.

Digitized by Google

at, or the doctrine of salvation through the *expiatory* death of Christ." [16]

Dr. Watts represents that "All mankind have broken God's law. Man, sinful man, is not able to make any satisfaction to God for his own sins, neither by his labors, nor by his sufferings. . . . . Because God intended to make a full display of the terrors of his justice, and his divine resentment for the violation of his law, therefore he appointed his own Son to satisfy for the breach of it, by becoming a proper sacrifice of expiation or atonement." [17]

Says Ambrose Serle, "Thou [Jesus] barest the griefs of millions; griefs, which would have sunk those millions into unutterable woe. Omnipotence itself groaned under the tremendous load." [18]

Speaking of the necessity of Christ's being "both true God and true man," Calvin says, "It was not indeed a simple, or, as we commonly say, an absolute necessity, but such as arose from the heavenly decree, on which the salvation of man depended. . . . . The flesh which he received from us he offered up as a sacrifice, in order to expiate and obliterate our guilt, and appease the just wrath of the Father." [19]

"It was impossible for God to be propitiated without the expiation of sins." [20]

"It was requisite that the Mediator should be God," says Thomas Ridgley, "that he might sustain and keep the human nature from sinking under the infinite wrath of God, and the power of death, and give worth and efficacy to his sufferings, obedience, and intercession; and so satisfy God's justice, procure his favor, purchase a peculiar people, give his spirit to them, conquer all their enemies, and bring them to everlasting salvation." [21]

"The persons, indeed, who were the offenders, were the prime objects of God's indignation; but then, in this method of proceeding, all mankind (for all had offended God) must have finally perished. . . . . A creature of less merit than the eternal Son of God, may be supposed

[16] Evans on the Atonement, p. 74.
[17] See Buck's Theological Dictionary, Art. Atonement.
[18] Christian Library, Vol. 1. p. 350.
[19] Institutes, Book 2. Chap. 12. [20] Chap. 15.
[21] Body of Divinity, p. 401.

Digitized by Google

deputed to the office of making satisfaction for sin; but admitting such a person to be, not only innocent, but able likewise to bear the heavy wrath of God; yet, as the obedience and sufferings of no creature could, from his own worth and excellency, be equivalent to the obedience and sufferings of all mankind; so, not only the performance of his sufferings, but even his innocence, and perseverance in righteousness, must be ascribed to the grace and goodness of God, not to any power of his own to sustain himself; and, consequently, the obedience and suffering of no created being, how perfect, how excellent soever, could have been of that value, as to merit for others; to make satisfaction to the divine justice, or procure the remission of human sins. For since death is ordained the punishment of sin, the effect of its remission must be immortal life. But now, how can we imagine that the death of any creature, not immortal itself, could procure for us a right to immortality? No, the sacrifice, that takes away sin, must not only die, must live again; must be able to give itself immortality, before we can be immortal by virtue of it; which brings the matter at length to this conclusion, that such a sacrifice must necessarily be man, must be an innocent man, must indeed be much more than man, must be God, as well as man; for the Scripture is express, that 'God only hath immortality,' and it is evident to common sense, that a being, which itself has not immortality, cannot give it to others." [22]

We have quoted thus freely from acknowledged Trinitarian authorities touching the atonement and its concomitant doctrines, both because of the vital importance of those doctrines, and that we might be sure to present that view of them which those authorities will sanction. Passing other points presented in these extracts, the reader will carefully observe the following particulars. 1. The law threatened eternal death. 2. All men by transgression had become exposed to that penalty. 3. Justice must be satisfied, by an expiatory sacrifice, or no man could be saved. 4. Neither man nor angel could make that sacrifice, since nothing short of the sufferings of a very God, could either satisfy the law, or merit for man

[22] Stackhouse's Body of Divinity, London edition, 1729, p. 578.

Digitized by Google

salvation. 5. Hence God, in the person of his Son, became the atoning sacrifice, and purchased redemption for man.

Now I will not say that Trinitarianism solves the problem it presents to itself. There appear to be insuperable difficulties, inherent in the scheme itself. The atoning sacrifice, be he finite or infinite, could not, from the very nature of the case, suffer the penalty due to a guilty world. That penalty was not *any* suffering of whatsoever kind; but it was suffering of a peculiar kind—suffering which originated in its own peculiar cause, and was confined to those in whom that cause existed. Being born of guilt, the innocent cannot know it. It springs not from foreign or imputed guilt—granting it possible that guilt can be imputed—but from actual personal guilt. This punishment, the atoning Mediator, be he God or man, if innocent, could not experience. However much, then, this appointed Redeemer might suffer, he could not suffer that remorse which properly constitutes the punishment of the guilty.

But another difficulty presents itself in this hypothesis, which vitiates the central fact of the atonement itself. I allude to the supposition that the atoning fact inheres in the death of him who makes the atonement. Hence Watts has sung,

"When God, the Mighty Maker, died!"[23]

But however this sentiment may have been received in the past, the idea that Almighty God has actually died, is now universally repudiated. If, therefore, the death of the Redeemer constitutes the crowning event in the work of atonement, Deity himself cannot have made the atonement; and, according to the foregoing extracts, no atonement can have been made by any other than Deity.

I am aware that the force of this latter difficulty, is supposed to be obviated by the alleged mysterious union in Christ, of the human and the divine. The infinite is believed to have shared in the sufferings of the finite, in such a manner as to have greatly enhanced their magnitude; so that, although Deity himself did not die, he so

[23] See also the authorities quoted above, particularly the last.

Digitized by Google

far entered into the sufferings attendant upon the death of the human, as to multiply those sufferings to an incalculable extent, and to impart to them an efficacy, which, as the sufferings of a mere finite being, they never could have had. Or, to state undisguisedly what I suppose to be the pith of this argument, the sufferings attendant upon the death of Christ, though it were but the death of his human nature, were so multiplied by the participation of the infinite therein, that they equalled in magnitude the sufferings that would have attended the death of all mankind. But, I would ask, how could this multiplication of sufferings be effected? What is the principle upon which it is supposed to have rested? Is it that the suffering attendant upon the death of a human being, is measured, not by his physical susceptibilities, but by his spiritual force? Or, in other words, does this argument assume that the sufferings attendant upon the death of the body, are measured by the greatness of the mind? This seems the only inference possible in the case. But is this principle sound? Suppose John Milton to have possessed a strength of mind equal to three times that possessed by the poet Collins; would it follow therefrom that Milton would have suffered three times as much as Collins from the amputation of a limb, or any physical infirmity? If this question must be answered in the negative,—and I suppose all theologians would so answer it—then how can it be maintained that the sufferings of the Saviour were enhanced by the conjunction of the infinite with the finite? Is there not reason to believe that the very reverse of this is the fact?—that the divine presence would have diminished, rather than increased, those sufferings?

But waving this point, and granting that the sufferings endured by the Saviour in his death, were so multiplied, by divine participation therein, as to equal in magnitude the punishment due to all mankind; still the former difficulty mentioned would remain. The sufferings of Christ, howsoever multiplied, would remain the same in kind, and would be of a character entirely unlike that which accompanies guilt. The force of this objection has been conceded by some who were otherwise Calvinistic in their views. The following extract from the Body of Divinity last cited, is to the point.

Digitized by Google

"The reproaches of a sinful mind, the killing anguish of despair, with several other aggravations of misery and sorrow, which go to making up the sinner's hell, cannot, in the nature of the thing, fall upon an innocent and divine person; they are the result of a guilty conscience only. But then, it should be considered, that, in the sad and doleful moments of his passion, the Saviour of the world had horrors and agonies of another kind; the heavy weight, though not the guilt, of universal sin, the fearful apprehensions of a painful and ignominious death, the busy powers of the prince of darkness, the smoking wrath and indignation of Almighty God, and the unrelenting strokes of his vindictive justice, all united against him, to sustain; while the divine nature withdrew, as it were, from his relief, and, though adding infinite merit to his sufferings, would not remove or abate him one pain."[24]

Here new ground is taken. The idea that Christ suffered the identical punishment due to a sinful world, is abandoned; and an equivalent amount of suffering, though of an entirely different kind, is substituted in its place. Now this change of issue, changes materially the primary fact, upon which the necessity of the atonement is supposed to rest. Dr. Owen says, "God's justice must be satisfied."[25] But instead of seeking satisfaction, by inflicting the threatened punishment upon the transgressor himself, God is supposed to be content with the substitution of an innocent person for the guilty, and of physical suffering on the cross, and mental apprehension, for that terrible remorse which was attached, as a suitable penalty, to his violated law. Surely a justice which could content itself with two so important shifts, bearing so vitally upon the demands of the law, might have remitted the punishment outright, or adopted any other scheme which the most arbitrary pleasure could have suggested.

Without attempting to enumerate all the difficulties, in which Trinitarianism involves itself, in connection with the atonement, we deem the foregoing of sufficient weight fully to warrant a rejection of the common phases of that doctrine. But at the same time that this has been made

[24] Stackhouse's Body of Divinity, p. 581.
[25] Owen on the 130th Psalm, p. 66.

Digitized by Google

to appear, it has also been made evident, that, waving all such objections, the common doctrine of the atonement cannot be supported for a moment, except upon the hypothesis that Christ is God. Whatever shift is made, this assumption necessarily remains. Whether we maintain that Christ suffered the identical penalty attached to the violated law, or suppose him to have suffered an equivalent, it is equally requisite that the Infinite should suffer, in order that the aggregate of sufferings might reach the necessary amount. Hence those who deny that Christ is God, must deny that Christ suffered, either the penalty of the law, or an equivalent thereto. And since it is plain that an atonement has been made, another phase of that doctrine must be adopted. The erroneous view does not primarily regard the sinner, but the law, and the abstract authority sinned against. On the other hand, the true view primarily regards the sinful. It is a direct reconciliation, not of God to a violated law, or to a sinful world, but of sinful man to a holy God. The sacrifice of Christ, instead of being an offering to appease the terrible wrath of an angry God, becomes a beautiful and triumphant testimony of God's undying love to the world. The erroneous view makes the atonement a judicial transaction, and is perfectly arbitrary. The true view gives it a moral aspect, and is strictly philosophical. Love being the essence of obedience, and Christ's death being the highest possible manifestation of love, and consequently the most powerful procuring cause of obedience, it is at the same time the efficient cause of the atonement. That atonement is a oneness in heart with God.

II. But the Unitarian idea of Christ[26] does more than modify the Calvinistic view of the atonement; it necessitates a modified view of the character of the law. The first and most obvious fact, touching this point, is that the Trinitarian scheme has mistaken the sanctions of the law.

[26] In calling the doctrine of Christ's subordination to the Father the Unitarian idea, I would not be understood as implying that it is an idea to which the sect known as Unitarian has any exclusive claim. The first body of men in this country, including any considerable number, who were open and out-spoken upon this doctrine and its concomitants, were Universalists; and among these the Rev. Mr. Ballou, of Boston, was preëminent. See Universalist Quarterly, Vol. v. Art. 28.

Digitized by Google

It has assumed those sanctions to be eternal death. While, therefore, it maintained the absoluteness or unqualified character of the law, salvation for transgressors was impossible. It was necessary, in the outset, so far to violate the original condition of the law, as to substitute an innocent person for the guilty; and then to make it possible that so great a penalty as eternal death could be suffered, it added the farther supposition, that the innocent person, thus appointed to suffer the penalty of the law, was God himself. Hence if Christ be not God, it is manifest, according to the Trinitarian hypothesis, that he cannot have suffered the penalty of eternal death. And if such a penalty was ever attached to the law, it must still remain in full force; and the salvation of even one transgressor, remains impossible. To avoid this issue, still conceding the Unitarian idea of Christ, and the absoluteness of the law, it will be necessary to admit that the sanctions of the law are not eternal death.

This modification of the sanctions of the law, cannot fail to affect the general character of the law itself. Owen says, "It is certain that the law neither knows *mercy nor forgiveness*. The very sanction of it lies wholly against them; 'The soul that sinneth, it shall die.'"[27] With eternal death for its sanction, and absoluteness, or unconditionality of character, it is manifest that it *can* know no mercy. Nor is the law alone destitute of mercy; the source whence it emanated, is equally destitute of that quality. God could have had no merciful design in giving the law. On the other hand, substitute moral in place of eternal death, as the sanction of the law, and the character of the law is materially modified. "The soul that sinneth, it shall die,"[28] becomes an absolute and unqualified truth. The sinful soul, immediately upon transgression, falls into that state of moral death. It remains in it so long as it remains sinful. The labor of Christ is to induce penitence, and awaken the soul to life. He does not interfere with the retributions of the law, but lifts the soul out of that moral condition and relation to the law, which subject it to its retributions. His labor, therefore, is not expiatory, but moral. And that moral death which a

[27] Owen on the 130th Psalm, p. 58. [28] Ezekiel xviii. 4.

Digitized by Google

transgression of the law induces, helps, by its warning influence, the accomplishment of Christ's labors; as the power of any evil helps turn us away from the causes of such evil. Thus, the very design of the law is merciful; and its absoluteness is no longer pretended only, but real and veritable. The law does its work, and Christ does his work, without any such shifts, or evasions of the law, as Trinitarianism is obliged to regard as honorable.

III. Having seen the modifying influence of the Unitarian idea of Christ, upon the doctrine of the atonement, and the character of the divine law, we are prepared to remark the changed aspect of the character of God himself, in the light of the same idea. Previous to the atonement by Christ, Trinitarianism represents God as unappeasably angry. Calvin speaks of the "vengeance of God," "the dreadful flame of the divine wrath," and of the necessity that man should be "terrified and distressed with the fear of the divine wrath, and the horror of eternal death." Ridgley is still more explicit. He speaks of man "sinking under the *infinite* wrath of God." And Stackhouse discourses upon "the smoking wrath and indignation of Almighty God, and the unrelenting strokes of his vindictive justice." [29] Christ is supposed to have appeased this wrath. Thus all the wrath is in God, and all the mercy in Christ.

Now, these representations are highly objectionable, both on account of the dishonor they cast upon the character of God, and the fact, that the origin of Christ's mission becomes inexplicable. The Scriptures represent that mission as an evidence of the divine love. [30] But if God had been angry, as the foregoing writers represent, there could have been no love with the Father, to suggest the mission of Christ. If we can be sure of any thing, we can be sure that "*infinite* wrath" necessarily excludes all love. Hence no cause remains from which Christ's mission could proceed. This problem, therefore, Trinitarianism cannot solve. But with the modified view of the atonement and the law, given above, there remains no such problem to be solved. God created man in love; gave him the law in love; redeemed him from sin by the labors of Christ in love; and in all

[29] See Extracts on preceding pages. [30] John iii. 16.

Digitized by Google

his providences and government manifests the continued and harmonious operation of that love. The "smoking wrath" upon the divine countenance, brightens into loving smiles; and the "unrelenting strokes of his vindictive justice," give place to evident tokens of his impartial grace.

It should be further remarked, that the view we present relieves the divine character of that double-dealing aspect, which Trinitarianism ascribes to it. That doctrine lifts the curtain, at one moment, and presents the Deity upon the stage, clothed, as we have seen, in all the garments of wrath. His brow is knit with a terrible anger, his breath is a burning flame, and the uplifted sword of justice is ready to be bathed in the blood of humanity. The scene changes, and lo! another appears under quite a different phase. Compassion marks every lineament. Forgiveness is breathed in every word. Universal love characterizes every deed. And, strange to say, when the secret is known, it appears that these two personages are one and the same. That God, "with whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning,"[3] makes both these conflicting demonstrations. Let those who feel respect for such a God, worship him; but save me the God who loved the world, and sent his Son a testimony of that love.

IV. But the modifying power of the Unitarian idea of Christ reaches still further. It changes the Trinitarian view of the doctrine of human inability, and of the method of regeneration. Faith in Christ's vicarious and meritorious sufferings, by which his righteousness is imputed to the penitent sinner, is the Trinitarian means of salvation. Thus the vicarious atonement is made the central object of saving faith. But man had not power to attain even to the cherishing of this faith. Being "averse to all good, and wholly inclined to all evil," he could do nothing but oppose, with all the vigor of a totally corrupted heart, those evidences of saving faith, which in the gospel were laid before him. Hence the miraculous power of God was called into requisition, to enable man to cherish saving faith. Up to this point, man's powers are supposed to be passive; and they come to be active thenceforward, only by the constant agency of God's special grace.

[31] James i. 17.

Digitized by Google

Now it will be readily seen, that in rejecting the Trinitarian view of the atonement, we change the character of saving faith. We strike away what was supposed to be its central fact. Its foundation is no longer Christ, as a vicarious sacrifice, but as a moral teacher. That faith becomes efficacious, not by an arbitrary appointment of God, by which Christ is accepted as our substitute; but by its own spiritual force, and inherent life-giving power. Christ, as a manifestation of the divine, becomes our Saviour; and he accomplishes the work of salvation in proportion as his moral lessons take effect in the heart. Viewed in this light, the work of regeneration puts off its arbitrary aspect, and becomes moral in its phase, both as respects its method and its results. Divine truth is seen to have a natural power over the human heart; and, consequently, the human heart is naturally susceptible to the influences of that power.[32] Thus Christ becomes in reality, the "Sun of righteousness," warming into life and activity the affections of the morally dead.

V. I remark, once more, that the truth of Christ's subordination to the Father, upon which we are proceeding, increases the probable extent of salvation. According to the Trinitarian hypothesis, Christ's peculiar mission was not so much to save man, as, by the satisfaction of the law, *to open a door for salvation.* Says Dr. Owen, "God's justice must be satisfied, and his holy indignation against sin made known. Wherefore, he has sent his Son *to make way for the exercise of mercy*, so as no way to eclipse the glory of his justice and holiness."[33] Christ's mission, then, is to clear the way for salvation. The actual salvation of man is another matter, and one which depends upon the sovereign pleasure of God. Those whom God has elected to be heirs of his grace, and who are consequently favored with the special influences of that grace, will, in due time, be lifted from the depths of entire corruption, to the throne of purity. Those not thus elected and graciously favored, will be borne down forever by the crushing weight of their own corruption.[34]

[32] Rom. i. 16. [33] Owen on the 130th Ps. p. 66.

[34] I allude to this doctrine of Sovereign grace as the Trinitarian view, notwithstanding it is becoming somewhat antiquated. It was adopted by Athanasius, Augustine, John Calvin, the Synod of Dort,

Digitized by Google

But whether the number of the elect is large or small, must be purely a matter of conjecture. If, however, we should estimate the number according to what we have already seen accomplished,—and why should we not, since their salvation, in regard to time as well as fact, depends on the sovereign pleasure of God?—we should judge the number to be extremely small. Or if we look upon Deity at the moment when this election is supposed to have been made, before Christ had satisfied his justice, his bosom being agitated with "infinite wrath" towards the whole race of mankind, and judge of the probable number of the elect, by the state of mind in which he made the election, we should estimate it still less. Indeed, we could easily believe, that such a God, at such a moment, would reprobate the whole race. Or, again, if we plant ourselves on the oft-repeated proposition, which accompanies all Trinitarian hypotheses, viz., "There will be no moral change after death," and remember that "without holiness no man shall see the Lord,"[35] the probable number of the saved sinks to an absolute zero. These alternatives leave the labors of Christ in such a position, that they bear but lightly on the direct work of salvation. The view we would commend, on the contrary, presents those labors, not as an attempt merely to open a door of salvation, but as an aggregate of influences, fitted to lead men to walk in an already open door. Embodying the transcendant love of God, they present to the world the highest manifestation of that love. Those manifestations, in their very nature, are regenerating. They awaken the affections, subdue the passions, enkindle devotion, sanctify the will, and arouse in the soul all that is holy and divine. These manifestations are for all. Their influence can never be restricted as to time or place. Their moral power must be the same for all hearts and for all worlds. Whenever and wherever the veils of passion or circum-

the Westminster Assembly of Divines, and is a necessary concomitant of those views of human depravity, received by all the partialist sects. Those who reject it, on account of its evident partiality and unmercifulness, refuse to abide the results of their own principles. They manifest the goodness of their hearts, at the expense of the soundness of their heads.

[35] Heb. xii. 14.

Digitized by Google

stance are so removed as to allow these manifestations to be seen, the work of redemption must begin. And unless God shall erase the record of his glories, and blot from the heavens the "Sun of righteousness," the power of his love will continue its conquests, until the last sinner shall join in the song of redemption; and the angelic ascription, "Glory to God in the highest,"[36] shall be echoed by a ransomed universe.

Thus have we assumed the Unitarian idea of Christ, and attempted to show the influence which that single truth must exert upon the doctrine of the atonement, the nature and sanctions of the divine law, the character of God, the doctrine of human inability and of regeneration, and the probable extent of salvation. I am aware that I have but very imperfectly developed the argument here adopted, also that the argument itself, considered with reference to the true view of these doctrines, is not the most direct, popular, or convincing. It can hardly be doubted that the truth of God's infinite love, throws the fullest and most direct light upon the darkness of Calvinism, possible to be thrown by any one truth. And those who pass this truth with but an occasional reference, and lay their foundation on the much narrower truth of Christ's subordination to the Father, really abandon the greater for the less. Nevertheless, what has been presented, may serve to show the importance of this truth, and lead those who are resting in it, and who still retain the balance of the Trinitarian scheme, to make further examination into its logical connections and consequences. A. A. M.

Article X.

Old Testament Prophecies Concerning Christ.

Are there in the Old Testament, any distinct prophecies concerning Christ? The answer to this question carries

[36] Luke ii. 14.

Digitized by Google

with it consequences of no inconsiderable magnitude. If Christ was distinctly foretold and described, as it regards his character and offices, the book in which it is done, gains, by that fact, a claim of divine authority, which it is not easy to evade or deny. If our Saviour was not foretold, he was, it may be, a man of mark, conspicuous among his fellows, yet walking like the rest of our race, this way of life, and in his entrance, and his exit, like the undistinguished multitude. We do not doubt that there are abundant means to refute such an opinion of him, aside from what we offer in this article. Yet if he was foretold in his offices, such an idea of him becomes instantly inadmissible. He stands, then, not as an isolated fact, but as a grand centre in an unfolded system, around which revolve a vast series of facts; as the focus in which centre, and from which diverge, the rays of an almost infinite concourse of purposes and providences relating to our race. And God declares, ages before, that so it shall be, and gives to man the promise of his coming, and a foresight of his reconciling mission.

Cyrus too was foretold, yet what we say of Christ cannot be said of him; for to him was not given the majestic greatness of that mission which prophecy predicts of Christ. Cyrus was for an age; Christ for all time. Cyrus was for a comparative handful of people; Christ for the immeasurable brotherhood of man. Cyrus retrieved a minor disaster, and restored a people to their old national standing; Christ broke the bonds that chained a groaning creation, revealed a Father's presence on earth, and a Father's house, many-mansioned in heaven; for him had God the Father sealed. This is the stupendous vision which stoops out of heaven, and overshades the whole horizon of the prophet's foreseeing eye, when he looks with rapt and solemn gaze on "him that shall come." God also appears before man as something more than the bearer of the iron mace of a law; he extends the golden sceptre of a promise. He is revealed, not as a far-distant Deity, who governs the world by an iron clock-work of laws, set to run a million of years and not vary a second, but as a sympathizing Father, who comes and looks in upon us, and asks us how we fare, gives us a promise that nourishes our hope, and renews the evidence of his assiduous and ever-constant watch over us.

Digitized by Google

If important results depend upon the answer we give to the question before us, it the more behooves us to be cautious in the examination of it. The notion that such prophecies exist, would not, *a priori*, be an unnatural one, and hence requires no extra array of proof to sustain it. It is in this respect wholly unlike, for example, the doctrine of endless suffering, or any such doctrine as requires overwhelming proof to justify a belief in it. Let it be observed, too, that a single prophecy establishes all the principles we contend for, and annihilates the whole array of objections. Yet the proposition that there are such prophecies, requires clear, distinct proof, before it can claim our belief. But how clear? how distinct? Is it to be such that no plausible objections can be urged against it? No! for we believe many things against which plausible objections can be alleged. Is it to be evidence, such as must at once command the belief of all who hear or read? No! it is not thus that God deals with men. Some work is always left for judgment and faith to do. What truth so evident that the human mind has never resisted it! How large the number of those that have met stubborn and prolonged resistance! It is not often that God overwhelms human doubt in a moment; when he does so, the conviction comes in a blinding beam, brighter than the sun at noonday, and, strong as a thunderbolt, it strikes him instantly to the earth on whom it falls. We look, then, for a revelation, clear, distinct, intelligible; and satisfying to honest common sense.

All secondary senses, all double meanings, all types and shadows, we feel constrained to abandon in this examination. By their nature, they are not proof, but things to be proved. If we make fast our anchor, let it be to the solid earth, and not to a floating island. These are equivocal, they depend too much on caprice, or spiritual eyesight. Therefore they cannot render certain what before was doubtful; too often do they becloud what is plain. They are themselves the offspring, and therefore cannot be the parent, of faith. He who goes to them to kindle his light, searches for them with a lantern lighted at some other source.

We deem the fact to be of great importance to the consideration of our subject, that "the expectation of an ex-

Digitized by Google

traordinary person who should arise in Judea, and be the instrument of great improvements in the manners and condition of mankind, was almost if not altogether universal at the time of our Saviour's birth; and had been gradually spreading, and getting strength for some time before it. The fact is so notorious to all who have any knowledge of antiquity that it is needless to attempt any proof of it."[1] The fourth Eclogue of Virgil, has long been noted for its resemblance in spirit and diction to the Hebrew prophets. Concerning this Eclogue, we would present the following facts. Pollio, to whom it is dedicated, had introduced the poet, then just rising into notice, to Octavius, who restored to him certain patrimonial lands, of which he had been plundered by the soldiers. It appears to have been this circumstance, which led him to write rural and pastoral poems, that he might thus appropriately express his gratitude to his munificent patron. This fourth Eclogue, it appears, was written near the end of the year of Rome 714, and about the time of the peace of Brundusium, where Anthony and Octavius parted the Roman world between them. At this period, Octavius and Pollio, often enemies, were for a short season friends. As a seal of their pacification, at Brundusium, Octavius had married Scribona, the sister of Pompey's wife; and she, very soon after her marriage, gave promise of issue. Virgil saw fit, for his own purposes, to take it for granted that this expected child would be a son; and to weave into the web of his destiny the gorgeous anticipations of this Eclogue. His poetic gifts, however, were evidently superior to his prophetic powers. The child proved to be a daughter, and she ill-starred and infamous. There can be no doubt, however, that Virgil drew his poetic inspiration, here, from the fount of Hebrew prophecy. This he might have learned of Herod, who was Pollio's friend, and who is well known to have feared the speedy advent of the Messiah; or he may have learned it from the Sibylline Oracles. It thus appears that this Eclogue is no more than an ingenious application of Hebrew prophecy to Roman affairs, for purposes of flattery. If the idea of this Eclogue was drawn from the Sibylline books, still we can

[1] Bp. Horsley's Diss. on the prophecies of the Messiah, dispersed among the heathen.

Digitized by Google

account for its Jewish origin. The ancient Sibylline books were destroyed before Virgil's time, about the year of Rome 650, and by order of the Senate were replaced by collections made in Asia, in the islands of the Archipelago, in Africa, and in Sicily. We may well suppose that portions of the Hebrew prophets were in the collection.[2] This view is greatly confirmed by the fact that both Tacitus and Suetonius have left record of an expectation, widely diffused through the East, that some one should arise out of Judea, and attain to universal dominion.[3] Neither Roman habits nor Roman pride would naturally ascribe such a distinction to Judea, rather than Rome. There was for it some powerful cause, and that cause can scarcely be other than the then general understanding of the intimations in certain passages existing in the Hebrew Scriptures. Those passages, then, had the effect to produce in the world an expectation of some remarkable personage, who should arise in Judea, about that time, and exercise a mighty influence in shaping the world's destiny; not by the Roman means of force and conquest, but by peace and justice. This, then, is a true and sufficient test of their prophetic nature. It was not the natural anticipations of men, which would have selected either that country, or those means; but the prophetic voice of God in the Old Testament, that produced, as his providence so gloriously and amply fulfilled, this expectation.

It is a matter not to be overlooked, that these Old Testament prophecies, contrary to the general narrowness of Jewish conceptions, represent *all* as sharing in the blessings brought by the Messiah. All the families of the earth

[2] N. Am. Review, Oct. 1847, p. 305, &c. Horsley p. 22. Lowth's Lect. on Heb. Poetry, p. 298, and note by S. Henley.

[3] *Suetonius:* "There had prevailed, throughout the whole East, an ancient and fixed opinion, that it was fated that, at that time, some should rise from Judea, and obtain the government of the world." *Tacitus:* "A persuasion was cherished by most, that it was contained in the ancient books of the priests, that the East should gain the ascendancy, and that some from Judea should obtain the government of the world." Suet. Vespasian c. iv. Tacit. Hist. l. v. c. xiii. I have quoted these two testimonies from p. 233 of "A Defence of Christianity, against the work of George B. English, A. M., by Edward Everett;" a work of very great interest, and abounding in facts relating to this whole subject.

Digitized by Google

are to be blessed in him. Such a conception, it must be admitted, we think, has in it more of the Godlike than the Jewish. If we have rightly apprehended the matter, it was by this very catholicity that Christ gave offence, when, in the beginning of his ministry, he read and began to make certain applications or illustrations of Isaiah, in the synagogue of Nazareth. He called to their minds the fact, that in a season of famine, Elias was sent not to a Jew, but a Gentile, though many widows were in Israel; and that Elisha cleansed, not one out of the multitude of Jewish lepers, but Naaman the Syrian. Two such facts were sufficient to arouse the anger of the whole synagogue of patriots, whose motto was "our country, right or wrong."

It is a significant fact, that notwithstanding the enmity between the Jews and Samaritans, the woman at the well, while she is ready enough to remind our Saviour of the feud between their nations, does not, on account of his being a Jew, refuse to believe that he is the Messiah. We see by this, that the Samaritans shared in the general expectation of which we have spoken. With all their enmity, they could not refuse to accept a Jewish Messiah, and to them, as well as the Jews, was he to "tell all things."

But it will be asked, "How did it happen, if there was in the Old Testament a prophecy of Christ, 'clear, distinct, and intelligible,' that when he came, men did not recognize him, and believe on him?" We will answer to this briefly, that the faith which could lead men to expect such a being, might very naturally not be strong enough to induce them to receive him, for it is no new thing that men should speculatively receive truths, which they have not faith to make practical. Men, too, are impatient of God's processes; they cannot wait to see "first the blade, then the ear," but wish to see at once "the full corn in the ear." That the idea of a suffering Messiah was not unknown to the Jews, some of their most ancient Rabbins will give witness. But when Christ appeared, they do not seem to have considered this. The national mind would pass lightly over any idea of this kind, and dwell on any passages which promised worldly success and grandeur. Their ideas of grandeur and success were prone to seek their symbols in the

Digitized by Google

swords of conquerors, and the regalia of kings.[4] The more nearly any passage conforms to these feelings, the more exclusively would their minds fasten upon it, and the more literally would they interpret it. Besides, if Christ was to elevate the world, he must not satisfy the world. God does not dwarf his truth down to men, but raises men up to his truth. Another thing is to be remembered, in reading these prophecies, and weighing all God's methods in this matter. If, before Christ's advent, the Jews had perfectly understood and appreciated all the prophecies respecting him, then the fulfilment of these prophecies could hardly have taken place, far less could all prophecy have been fulfilled. In a nation raised fully to the standard, and filled with the spirit of the Messianic prophecies, how should he have been as he was, "a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief, despised and rejected of men?" The life and death of Christ, as it would plainly have been impossible among them, would also have been needless.

But as many a man may probably believe in the existence of Newton, who can but awkwardly explain who Newton was, or in what his greatness lay; so the ancient Jews are proper witnesses of the fact, that a coming Messiah had been foretold, although when they saw him, they knew him not, but were "astonished at him." We might say to them with an accommodation of Paul's language: "Whom ye ignorantly believe in, him declare we unto you." The prophecy was not lost on them. It kept them perpetually looking forward with trust and hope in God, as it now causes us to look back with reverence and confidence. If, when the fulfilment of this hope was before them, they thrust it aside, closed hands with a delusion, and walked deliberately on into outer darkness; the prophecy has not failed, though they have erred and fallen. The true God, the true hope, the true word, still endure, and are stedfast as the heavens.

[4] The modern Samaritans expect a Messiah, whose seat of government is to be at Napolous the ancient Sichem. He is to live one hundred and twenty years, as did Moses, and reign over all the earth. All who oppose him are to be cut off by the sword — the only certain method of overcoming dissent, which comes within the scope of their philosophy. See Rob. Calmet, Art. Samaritan. Sichem.

Digitized by Google

Having thus considered this almost universal expectation of the nations, thus centring in Judea, we next pass to consider the facts which originated, sustained, and justified it. In the third chapter of Genesis, is the record of a general curse pronounced on man and woman. They had fallen under the dominion of sin or evil, of which the serpent stands as the symbol. They, who gazing upon the sun in its splendor, had first seen a dark cloud pass over it, quench its beams, devour its light, and apparently swallow up its whole substance, might well mourn it as forever lost, and feel a trembling horror at the sight. Not less when innocence had fled, and guilt stood in its place, when death's dark cloud had brought sudden midnight on life's fair beams, might they think the horror and loss eternal, and bewail them with a boundless anguish. The serpent has the ascendancy, and no limit appears to it. But then is the promise made that the seed of the woman shall bruise the serpent's head. This declaration is of the most general kind. It does not say when, how, where, whether by an individual or a multitude. Yet it stands as a promise. Spoken in that hour of darkness, it assures them and theirs that evil shall not always bear the sway. *It has disappointed no hope; it has proved true*, — true in Jesus Christ. True in a large, a noble, a benign sense, worthy of the Being who uttered it, commensurate to the extent of that wide-spreading ruin, amidst whose first germinating seeds, (and wide has been their harvest!) it was spoken. Who can tell how much the hope produced by that promise, has done to cheer, to uphold, and to bless sorrowing humanity.

We will next consider a promise made to Abraham, Gen. xii. 3. "In thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed." Blessed! How? When? To what amount? It does not say. The doubter then will cry out, "It is nothing worth." But pause. Was it not fitted to excite hope in the human family? Dare we deny that in Abraham's seed there did come upon all, a chosen, an inestimable blessing? You say the promise fixes nothing. Nay, it fixes two things: First, a blessing to all; Second, It shall come in Abraham's seed, — as after events fixed it, — in Judea. Such a promise must have excited much undefined hope; yet has its fulfilment disappointed no

Digitized by Google

reasonable expectation. It has been kept in a manner proper to the glory of Him who made it. It has, then, one of his great attributes, *truth*, — grand, majestic truth.

We pass on. Jacob, when near his death, prophesies to his sons, saying: "The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until Shiloh come, and unto him shall the gathering of the people be." Gen. xlix. 10. The first text we adverted to, contained only a general promise of the bruising of the serpent's head, by the seed of the woman; a promise somewhat vague and general, though hopeful. The second text particularizes the seed of Abraham, and promises a blessing in that seed to all the families of the earth, whether by one individual or many. This, the third, restricts and so defines the promise to one personage, who should fulfil it, Shiloh; also, as to time, that it shall be before the sceptre shall depart finally from Judah; and that to Shiloh the nations, which in Hebrew speech means the Gentiles, shall be gathered, implying a universal dominion. We have already assurance that the promise to the first pair should be fulfilled by an individual, that he should be a Hebrew, that the few families who heard the promise should become a nation before he came, and that they should not cease to be such, until he came; in other words, that Jew and Gentile should be blessed in him. All this is fulfilled signally in Jesus Christ. Soon after his coming the Jewish state became a Roman province, and not many years passed before it was desolated and destroyed. The genealogies of the tribes were lost, so that Judah cannot be distinguished from the others. The more ancient Jewish writers, in common with most Christian authors, interpret this text of the Messiah.

Were we anxious to make as large as possible the *number* of those passages in which we find prophecies of Christ, we might introduce several, which have been by many so applied; and we might offer reasons of weight for that application; yet we must confess, not such as seem decisive, nor such as answer the terms in which we proposed our inquiry. Such, for instance, as the text in Deut. xviii. 18, where God promises to raise up to the Israelites a prophet like unto Moses. It is well known that the Jews in our Saviour's time looked still for "that

Digitized by Google

prophet." But we cannot of course take their views or expectations as by any means decisive in these matters. It may be urged that in Acts iii. 22, 23, Peter expounds this passage as relating to Christ; but our question is not, What inspiration might declare to be the meaning of a passage, but, What would the plain common sense of men learn from it; for by this rule alone could it be safely studied during the time that it was needed as a prophecy to sustain the hopes of men. That this promise had a sufficient fulfilment, in Isaiah for instance, will not we think be denied by any one. We have discarded double senses. This prophecy, be it observed, differs from the others we have noticed, in being Jewish: "I will raise *them* up a prophet," — "he shall speak unto *them*," — while the others are universal in their promise. It is of far more importance, however, that the proofs we adduce should be clear and decisive, than that they should be multiplied. If we can establish *one* clear instance of prophetic declaration, it prostrates the whole argument of infidels and rationalists, on the great subject of special divine interference in human affairs. It breaks down the gate of their citadel, or, to continue our military phrase, it turns their position, so that all their strongholds are useless. We have, then, established the *fact*, of the special divine interference; the only question is, To how many instances does it extend? — a question comparatively of no moment.

We pass, then, to consider Isaiah lii. 13 — liii. 15. It is worthy to be remembered first, that the most ancient Jewish writers extant, apply this passage to Christ. Second, that for seventeen centuries, the Christian church applied it to him. Third, that any who in later times have dissented, have probably been led to do so by doubts on the whole subject of prophecy rather than by any question as to the intention of this particular passage. Fourth, that of those who refuse to apply it to the Messiah, Jew or Gentile, scarce any two agree as to its positive intention; which shows that while the meaning commonly assigned to it accords with its expressions, the attempt to impose another meaning upon it finds no guidance in its phraseology, but wanders in perplexity. The only opposing hypothesis, which seems to us to be

Digitized by Google

worthy of any serious notice, is that which explains "my servant" here, as denoting the Jewish people. In several places in Isaiah, under the name of Jacob, or Israel, the people of Israel are addressed as an individual, as God's servant; Isa. xli. 8; xliii. 10; xliv. 1 and 21; xlix. 3, are examples. Yet the language in these places is sometimes that of rebuke, in others, of encouragement, but is not, in any degree, like that of the passage under consideration. Then, we have in this passage sentences which it is impossible to apply to Israel; for example: "But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was smitten for our iniquities." Who could, in any sense, say this of the Jewish nation? How can it be applied to a people whose self-condemning plea is, that the promised Messiah is delayed on account of their own sins? The same prophet, indeed, xliii. 3, 4, says, in God's name, to Jacob, "For I am Jehovah, thy God, the Holy One of Israel, thy Saviour: I gave Egypt for thy ransom, Ethiopia and Seba for thee. Because thou hast been precious in my sight, thou hast been honored and I have loved thee. Therefore will I give men instead of thee, and people instead of thy soul." Thus they are represented not as ransoming others, but as being ransomed by others. But it will perhaps be asked, How are we to understand that Christ was wounded for our transgressions, &c.? I reply, that if you take away from his character all conception of patient suffering, of voluntary humiliation, and heroic obedience — and all these endured not for himself, but for others, you take from him both his glory and his power as the Captain of our salvation.

Again, the text reads "he had done no wrong:" but God says, by his prophet, to the Jews, xliii. 24, "Thou hast burthened me with thy sins, thou hast wearied me with thine iniquities." Throughout the whole, his humiliation is represented as voluntary on his own part, in submission to the pleasure of Jehovah. This in no way describes any affliction which came upon the Jewish nation. Their sufferings were all retributive, not voluntary, but imposed as a just punishment for their disobedience. Morally, there is an infinite distance between the two cases.

While we find this prophetic language to be in no way descriptive of the Jewish people in that or any age, what

Digitized by Google

is it but a perfect, a comprehensive compendium of the life, character, and mission of the Lord Jesus Christ. Like the other promises which we have considered, it is not Jewish, but catholic, in its scope: "he shall sprinkle many nations," "he shall see of the travail of his soul and be satisfied," he "shall justify many," for by the offence of one "many were dead." He is not a Saviour of Jews, nor a king of Jews, but a Saviour of men. We find this scripture in a book professedly prophetic; it was delivered among a people recognizing and expecting grand and special interferences of divine Providence; who had received previous promises of a universal blessing, to come in their nation, through one who should appear. The very air and diction of the passage were worthy of the subject revealed, and of God the revealer, if such a thing can be said of aught ever uttered in human speech. Finally, lofty as are its diction and the hopes it inspired, we can find for it a loftier fulfilment in Jesus Christ, the Saviour of the world.

We feel that this regal testimony is entitled to *command*, though it may not *compel*, belief. How it has affected the modern Jews, we may learn by the involuntary testimony to be drawn from their fiction of two Messiahs, one the son of Joseph, or of Ephraim, who was to be slain by the Gentiles, the other the son of David. To the former of these, the Jews referred those passages which Christians interpret of the sufferings of our Lord; and to the latter, those which we apply to his triumphs. This they do in opposition to their more ancient writers, such as Jonathan, in his Targum, who paraphrases, "Behold my servant the Messiah shall prosper," &c. One of the most respectable of later date, Moses Alshek, in the seventeenth century, says, "Our Rabbies of blessed memory established this passage of king Messiah, having received it thus by tradition; and let us follow them."[5]

Into the chronological arcana of the seventy weeks of Daniel, it would profit little for us to attempt to go. We would, however, call to mind a few simple facts. First:

[5] I have quoted this from the book of Prof. Everett, before mentioned, in which it is also stated, on the authority of Mr. Frey, a learned convert from the Jews, that they omit the whole 53d chapter from their Sabbath lessons. pp. 143, 144.

Digitized by Google

We have here the name Messiah twice used, which is the appellation given by the Jews to their expected king. The word is elsewhere in the Scriptures used, it is true, but it is connected with some name as a qualifying appellative, signifying that the person mentioned was anointed; but here it stands absolute, and has therefore a peculiar application. Second: This is the only scripture which pre-announces the time of the Messiah's appearance. That it was intelligible to the men of those times, is evident from the universal expectation of the speedy advent of the Messiah, about the period when he actually appeared. This fact receives most unexceptionable proof, from the number of false Messiahs who appeared about this time. What the Jewish opinion was, as to the time fixed in Daniel, may be gathered from their recorded curse: "Let his bones be crushed who presumes to calculate the advent of the Messiah;" and also by their tradition, "that when Jonathan had finished his Targum on Job, Proverbs, and the Psalms, and was come to Daniel, he was restrained by a voice which bade him 'give over there, lest the sons of men should learn from Daniel the times of the Messiah.'"[6] The prophecy, then, has satisfied the plain demands of common sense, in producing amongst those to whom it was delivered, and among their successors, the expectation of the advent of the Messiah, near a certain definite point of time: 1, He shall come: 2, he shall come at such a time. That this prophecy was fulfilled, in both points of this expectation, it is easy to show.

Pausing here, let us sum up the testimony we have adduced.

1. There was a general expectation, both among Jews and Gentiles, about the time of Christ's advent, that a great personage should arise in Judea, and attain to universal dominion.

2. Revelation aside, there was no good reason to expect such a personage; no more reason to expect him in that, than any other age; and less reason by far to expect him in Judea, than elsewhere.

3. That in the sacred books of a nation, living in this land, singular in worshipping only one God, claiming

[6] Everett's Defence, p. 166

Digitized by Google

also special interpositions of his providence in their behalf, mention is made of one to arise in their tribes, in whom should be a remedy for universal evil, and a blessing for all the families of the earth; who should suffer and be humiliated, not for his own sins, but for those of others, and be satisfied with the fruits of his suffering. The time of his coming was also announced.

4. That among that people did arise one, about the expected time, plenarily fulfilling those promises in letter and spirit, and declaring that they related to him, and showing, in precept and act, a spirit worthy both the author and the subject of those ancient prophecies.

The question now recurs: Were those ancient oracles prophecies of him? To that question, we think no further or formal answer is needed. E. F.

Article XI.

Whittier's Poems.

Poems by John G. Whittier illustrated by H. Billings, &c. Boston: Benjamin B. Mussey & Co. 1849.

It would seem that, of all classes of writers, those who attempt "the art divine" are the most likely to be misjudged on their first appearance. A thousand causes are always at work to magnify or to conceal their merit in the eyes of spectators, but more so at their entrance on the stage. So far as poetry is imitative, it is subject to the disadvantage that caricature, or extravagance, commonly takes the popular applause, before modest truth. Indeed, with respect to poetry of all kinds, the taste with which people appreciate it, is far too subtile an element to be fixed, and too susceptible of intermixtures from abroad to remain pure under the least agitation. It is often discomposed by the very effort to judge truly; "come, let us sit in judgement," is a signal not more disquieting to the poor author, than to the finer sentiments of the arbiters

Digitized by Google

themselves. Taste is liable to spontaneous fickleness through love of novelty, and is ever ready to be affected by influences from without and from within the mind,—by prejudice, fashion, attachment to particular interests, fondness for certain speculations or modes of thought, and by nearly every thing that is stirring in the world. Even the opinion of critics and connoisseurs, though more deliberately formed, is exposed, for this very reason perhaps, to still greater danger from some of these quarters; since conscious deliberation is apt to call up all one's prejudices, and to bring the artificial habits of one's mind foremost in play. Whether it be popular taste or professional opinion, it is, in both cases, swayed by so many adventitious circumstances, and by so many internal impulses, that a considerable time must pass, before the disturbing forces will subside, and the needle settle in its true and final direction.

We scarcely need say that these suggestions are verified by the history of criticism and popular favor, in this country as well as in other countries. Every one can recollect some three or four American poets, who, for a while, enjoyed a distinguished reputation among our reviewers and verse-readers, especially among those of certain classes, but who have already passed out of notice in every quarter. Many others were hailed at first as new stars, who turned out to be but shooting meteors, and in some cases but phosphorescent exhalations, or exhalations without the phosphorescence; while some, again, who were for a long time disregarded, except by a few, have since risen to a respectable standing in the public estimation.

So many instances of the kind have occurred within our own memory and observation, that we feel we ought to be cautious in making up, and especially in publishing, our judgement of any new candidate for the laurels. We certainly should not like to set down in these pages any blunder that might convict us of incompetence. The author of the volume before us is not one whose claims are now for the first time presented. In one way or another, he has been before the public so long, that the reviewer who, at this late day, pronounces a false or mistaken verdict in his case, cannot plead for indulgence on

Digitized by Google

the ground that he was taken by surprise, but must abide his responsibility, as his decision is at least a deliberate one. He, as well as his author, is committed irretrievably to the issue.

With this fear before our eyes, and notwithstanding the wariness that has been taught us by the mistakes alluded to, we still must avow, in decided terms, our admiration of Mr. Whittier's genius. We must venture to name him as one of the two who should be ranked highest in the catalogue of American poets, if his rank may be determined by the more excellent half of his productions. We are aware that there are several others who excel him, if we regard merely the workmanship of the art. In this, he is now and then quite deficient, though not through want of capability, as many of his pieces show. Perhaps he undervalues artistic excellence; perhaps he deems it an acquisition not worth the time it would take from severer duties, or thinks it may be dispensed with in the presence of higher properties; a judgement, however, to which we should demur. Were his essential merits of a lower order, we should not so much regret blemishes in the workmanship. His lines, though in general very significant, are sometimes crude, sometimes filled out with verbiage to make up the measure; his rhymes do not always come within the conditions of what Walker calls the "allowable;" and, in a very few instances, when the verse would not conform to the accent of his proper names, he has resorted to a Mohammed-like alternative, and made the accent, and even the syllabication, conform to the verse. But with all these occasional faults, as an artist, and with some others of a more general character, he has "the anointed eye," together with the heart and imagination, of a poet, in a greater degree than any of his American brethren with whom we are acquainted. We know not where, among them, we could find the calm, clear depth of thought and feeling, through which he looks out on his objects, whether of external nature, or of human character and interests; and through which he sees every thing invested with a rich but chastened light, reflected from the inmost recesses of his soul. This we take to be the peculiar psychology of a poet. It is true, when that depth of soul is stirred up from the very bottom by the

Digitized by Google

sense of wrong, it is at times like a volcano at sea, bursting through the waves in fierce eruption, and, at other times, like the ocean heaved by tempest, and running mountain high, — an awful immensity of power that bears all before it. But in his usual moods, this power reveals itself only in the characters of alternate beauty and tenderness, earnestness and majesty. Nor is this profoundness of imagination and feeling his only distinction. We have seen this property so often ascribed to mere extravagance, or to the facility of making unnatural combinations, that the mention of it may be regarded as suspicious. But we know not where else we could find, among our countrymen, the perfect truthfulness of conception that lies under his imaginative coloring, together with his warm, unaffected geniality of spirit, tempered with just enough of pensiveness to give it a romantic charm, — all brought out in so natural a freshness of expression and imagery. We say this only of the better class of his poems, for there is great inequality among them.

It would be absurd, perhaps, to attempt a parallel between him and the older poet, with whom we have associated him in rank. Indeed, their characteristics are so diverse as to admit of no regular parallel. Nevertheless, there are some points, we can hardly say of resemblance, but of equality and difference, that may be mentioned. We do this for the advantage it will give us in illustrating his character. By comparing it with a well-known standard, it will become the more distinct.

Both he and Bryant have the same truthfulness of conception, without which imagination but creates monsters, or draws caricatures, instead of heightening effects. Both have nearly an equal love of nature, but with the difference that the latter is nicer, and therefore more exclusive in selecting his objects. He is equally exact in his observation, at least of his favorite scenes, and perhaps even surpasses in point of acuteness; while Whittier takes in a wider, freer, and more varied range of objects. The wild, barren, and desolate, as well as the beautiful, reflect their latent, mysterious grace, when touched by his wand. We think, also, that his communion with nature is more immediate. We come at his objects and scenery more directly; not barely seeing them, though ever so

Digitized by Google

vividly and truly, as in Bryant, but we are present with them on the spot, seeming to breathe-in their freshness, to hear their music, to feel all their influences as we feel them in actual life; we have a living sympathy with every thing around us. This is one of the most infallible tests, the *crux experimenti*, of a poet's power. In the expression of feeling of whatever sort, we cannot but think Whittier the more genial, if compared either with Bryant, or with almost any of the rest. There is the pleasant warmth of the heart in his poetry, not because he strives to call it up, but because it comes there of itself. Occasionally, when roused to the last degree of vehemence, it may be that he now and then "o'ersteps the modesty of nature;" but with what effect? As a matter of fact, never has there been any thing sent forth, that kindled, and fired, and bore the hearts of men along, as some of his anti-slavery pieces have done. This is proof, that if he offends, he "gloriously offends." Let a cold critic find what faults he may, still in those mighty torrents of mingled enthusiasm and poetry, Whittier has no equal, probably in the whole world.

There is another advantage that we are disposed to ascribe to him, though it may not be recognized among the peculiar properties of a poet: His charity, which is coextensive with the liberality of Bryant, is underlaid, if we mistake not, with a more positive and definite religious faith; and this contributes indirectly, yet in a much greater degree than will be commonly believed, to give depth and vitality to his effusions. It is not out of place to mention this characteristic, here; for every thing that belongs to the man comes into action in the higher exercises of genius, and leaves its mark on the result. Whittier is always in earnest; a reserve of urgent purposes hovering in the background of his lightest pictures. This prevents him from ever descending to the sentimental, though no man deals more in sentiment. The motto, which he has taken from Coleridge, and inscribed on his title-page, was most happily chosen, as expressive of his own rigorous self-questioning:—

——"Was it right,
While my unnumbered brethren toiled and bled,
That I should dream away the entrusted hours

Digitized by Google

On rose-leaf beds, pampering the coward heart
With *feelings all too delicate for use?*"

Even in his meditative and in his playful moods, he stands girded up for the great work of his life, bound by conscience to do battle against all wrong, and in behalf of all suffering. Bryant's heart is, perhaps, equally steadfast in the same cause; but he lacks the intense fervor that distinguishes the devotion of his fellow-laborer. The latter has the serene philanthropy of a Channing, strangely united with the vehemence of one of the old prophets. We may add that both are truly American in their choice of subjects and of imagery; we think, however, that Whittier is the more thoroughly so in his taste and manner, as well as richer in the variety of materials he has appropriated from his native land. With all his cosmopolitan philanthropy, his heart remains at home. As an artist, Bryant far surpasses him in every thing that relates to form. He is always careful to produce a symmetrical whole, and then to finish his verse by working it down to the last degree of consistence and harmony. He never suffers his Muse, as Whittier sometimes does, to wander in her strain, or sing on after she has ended her song proper.

It would do us injustice to suppose that we have aimed to furnish a regular sketch of Bryant. Our object was to take only such characteristics belonging to him as we thought would help, by comparison, to illustrate more fully those of our author. As to any question of general precedence between them, we do not attempt to determine it; a task which, were it practicable, we are sure neither would thank us for assuming. We have spoken of these two as, on the whole, the first among American poets. It will, of course, be understood that we do not mean to compare them with the great European masters, of the last generation, whose lives were devoted to their art, and whose genius placed them almost above the hope of competition.

It is very difficult to select, from such a writer as Whittier, specimens which, when thus cut out from their connection, will represent him justly. An eminent lecturer has likened the practice, in another case, to extracting a fine eye, and presenting it on a surgeon's plate, that the

Digitized by Google

spectators may see for themselves its kindling glance. Notwithstanding the disparagement, however, we cannot well dispense with the custom. A few extracts, garbled though they be, are necessary as the subject of some remarks we propose to offer.

Among his descriptions of natural scenery, let us take the first lines of his poem on the Merrimack,—premising that the point of view appears to be on some of the eminences of Salisbury, overlooking the Powow, and commanding a prospect of the Merrimack down to its mouth.

> "Stream of my fathers! sweetly still
> The sun-set rays thy valley fill;
> Poured slantwise down thy long defile,
> Wave, wood, and spire beneath them smile.
> I see the winding Powow fold
> The green hill in its belt of gold,
> And, following down its wavy line,
> Its sparkling waters blend with thine.
> There's not a tree upon thy side,
> Nor rock, which thy returning tide
> As yet hath left abrupt and stark
> Above thy evening water-mark;—
> No calm cove with its rocky hem,
> No isle whose emerald swells begem
> Thy broad smooth current; not a sail
> Bowed to the freshening ocean gale;
> No small boat with its busy oars,
> Nor gray wall sloping to thy shores;
> Nor farm-house with its maple shade
> Or rigid poplar colonnade,—
> But lies distinct and full in sight,
> Beneath this gush of sunset light." p. 75.

Goethe has pronounced strong "objectivity" to be one of the first requisites of a true poet. Nothing can exceed the clearness with which the general scene is here brought out to view, and shown in its appropriate light and shade. The several objects that fill up the outline do not seem to stand apart; they belong together, and are but features of one whole. There are many who can vividly present single points, or describe in fragments; but it is a different order of spirits who, by a sketch, can give a wide and diversified picture in its entireness, and keep it true to

Digitized by Google

nature while they shed, over all, the coloring of their imagination. To this we must add another characteristic. Every thing here, though reposing in beautiful quiet, is full of life. A *materialistic* critic might seek to account for the effect, by the free play of the verse, the happy selection of particulars, &c. But all these do not reach down to the principle. They are themselves but an effect, and not the producing power. As our great orator has said, on another subject, "words and phrases may be marshalled in every way, but they cannot compass it." It is the poet's sympathy with the scene, the mysterious power by which he diffuses himself, as it were, out over the whole, and feels as well as sees the several parts of which it is composed,—it is this that puts us in communication with his subject, at the same time that it selects his particulars for him, and attunes his verse. Wave, wood and spire smile beneath the sunset rays that are poured slantwise down the long valley; the evening tide is returning; the sail bows to the freshening breeze from the ocean; the little boat plies its oars; all objects lie distinct in the golden light that gushes from the west. The poet seizes the whole in its living state,—in action. The same scene is afterwards presented, but at a later moment, and under a changed aspect:—

> "But look!—the yellow light no more
> Streams down on wave and verdant shore;
> And clearly on the calm air swells
> The twilight voice of distant bells.
> From ocean's bosom, white and thin
> The mists come slowly rolling in;
> Hills, woods, the river's rocky rim,
> Amidst the sea-like vapor swim,
> While yonder lonely coast-light, set
> Within its wave-washed minaret,
> Half-quenched, a beamless star and pale,
> Shines dimly through its cloudy veil." p. 77.

In these passages, and in others with which the volume abounds, we cannot but feel how directly the poet transfers his own impressions from the scenes of nature to ourselves. We receive them through him, as by magnetic communication; we take them in their first glow and

Digitized by Google

warmth. This power of enchantment, when associated with truthfulness and entireness of conception, is a very rare gift; but it is a distinguishing property of all high poetic genius. We need not speak of the singular force with which it characterizes Shakspeare's occasional sketches of natural scenery, and all his allusions to external objects. In Milton, it seems to glorify almost every page. Among the great English masters, of the last generation, Byron stands unequalled in this respect. Burns possessed the complex faculty in remarkable intensity; Scott, in large degree, but in a much more diffuse form. Coleridge had no truthfulness of conception,—he lived too much on laudanum; and his very "objectivity," so far as he had it, was oppressed by his overweening egotism. Some give us, for nature, either a fairy world or a hob-goblin world. Then, again, in reading some of the first-rate versifiers, who are respectable too for truthfulness of outline, we find occasion to complain that they seem to have studied, and measured, and even analyzed their objects scientifically, or wrought upon them with some philosophical alchemy, till all the freshness of them is gone. They give us preserved specimens, instead of the living, growing foliage; or, they give us nature at second-hand, after it has been exhausted of its native spirit in its passage through their own minds. This fault abounds in no less a poet than Wordsworth. His descriptions, always exact indeed, sometimes approach too nearly the character of mere enumerations, and still oftener want the free unconscious developement that belongs to life; though, when he rises above his philosophical rules, he redeems himself,—nobly, now and then.

We know not whether we have chosen the happiest phrases for expressing this power. But, supposing them intelligible, we cannot insist too strongly on this as the true power, in distinction from the other forms with which it has been contrasted. Some additional examples, which we intended, under this head, to give from our author, must be taken in fragments; though each will present a whole in itself. See the several views, in his ideal excursion through the mountain region of New Hampshire; we say, ideal, for we are told that he had never been on the spot. And yet how true to life is every thing presented!

Digitized by Google

"We had been wandering for many days
Through the rough northern country. We had seen
The sunset, with its bars of purple cloud,
Like a new heaven, shine upward from the lake
Of Winnepiseogee; and had felt
The sunrise breezes midst the leafy isles
Which stoop their summer beauty to the lips
Of the bright waters."

On reaching the White Mountains,

"we had passed
The high source of the Saco; and, bewildered
In the dwarf-spruce belts of the Crystal Hills,
Had heard above us, like a voice in the cloud,
The horn of Fabyan sounding. And a-top
Of old Agioochook, had seen the mountains
Piled to the northward, shagged with wood, and thick
As meadow mole-hills; the far sea of Casco,
A white gleam on the horizon of the east," &c.

In their excursion still farther to the north,

"we had seen the moon,
Rising behind Umbagog's eastern pines,
Like a great Indian camp-fire."

Afterwards, while travelling down from the Great Notch towards Conway,

"it chanced
That, as we turned upon our homeward way,
A drear northeastern storm came howling up
The valley of the Saco;"

continuing, till they reached the noted rendezvous for tourists,—

"So, in that quiet inn,—
Which looks from Conway on the mountains, piled
Heavily against the horizon of the north
Like summer thunder-clouds,—we made our home;
And while the mist hung over dripping hills,
And the cold wind-driven rain-drops, all day long,
Beat their sad music upon roof and pane," &c.

Bridal of Pennacook, pp. 9—12.

Digitized by Google

Examples of the kind might be quoted without number; for, in all his poems, whatever be the general topic, his love of natural scenery finds room for free play. We would observe that while treating, hitherto, of this power to represent nature, we have purposely spoken of it as it is exerted only on objects of sight; because, in these, it is the most readily distinguished, we think, from the false and the imperfect. But there could be no greater mistake than to suppose it confined to these. It extends equally to almost every thing within the sphere of observation; to sounds and motions, to manners and characters, &c. Of its effect in realizing sounds, we have an instance or two in the examples already given,—as the horn of Fabyan echoing back from the cliffs, and the sad music of the drops beating on roof and pane. The same truthfulness and life mark his conception of persons. The men and women he has occasion to speak of, appear before us as real individuals, that belong to the historical world and not to the mythical. They are not mere characters, as is the case with the creations of "subjective" genius; they have a bodily presence. However strongly distinctive, their traits are perfectly natural; and, what is of much more importance, the imaginative coloring is perfectly healthful, betraying no disease in the mind of the poet. His Indians, from the drunken Mogg Megone up to the loving-hearted Weetamoo, are, under all characters, sueh Indians as God makes, not such as Cooper sometimes exhibits. But we have not space to exemplify the several positions, as the reader may do by consulting almost any of the legendary pieces.

They who have known Whittier only by his stormy lyrics, as those in the cause of Reform have been called, will be surprized to find the deepest and most genial sentiments pervading his poems. We naturally ask, What means it, that he who seemed to ride the blast like an eagle exulting in its might, is as domestic, as full of all gentle and quiet affections, as a dove! Yet the contrast need not surprize us, for we may detect the presence of these very qualities in his most vehement moods. The lightning that scorches, and the thunder that awes, are but manifestations of the same genial element that gives vital-

Digitized by Google

ity to all living things. We are aware that it is too common to apologize for passionate violence in a good cause, by tracing back the abuse to its origin in some noble principle. This is not what we mean in his case. With him, the violence, or rather the vehemence, retains its original qualities still, of which it is only a more intense form. His very indignation at his country's misdeeds, bears the character of wounded patriotism, and his withering scorn of the oppressor or of the recreant, appears but as the spirit of outraged humanity. It is this pervading element that gives his trumpet-like peals their force to stir the heart so thoroughly. When the topic is changed, he passes into his accustomed serenity. He delights to linger around old associations and remembrances; the antique has a peculiar spell upon him, Radical though he is; he loves the very hearth-stones of his home, and is ever ready to appreciate all the forms that have been sanctified by human life. Nor does there appear any constraint, any thing unnatural, in this change of mood. We feel that it is the same man in both phases, as we feel there is the same ground-work of character in John of the Apocalypse and in John the Evangelist.[1]

What we admire, in his utterances of sentiment and emotion, is the air of reality that characterizes the whole. The feelings he expresses are neither affected, nor got up for the occasion; they are such as belong to the man in his own sound state of mind, and are not overcharged nor desperately intensified. We give an example or two from his memorial to "Lucy Hooper," who died at Brooklyn, L. I.

"They tell me, Lucy, thou art dead—

* * * * * *

Even as thou wert I see thee still;
And,—save the absence of all ill
And pain and weariness, which here
Summoned the sigh or wrung the tear,—
The same as when, two summers back,

[1] On the principles of some Biblical critics, might not a strong plea be made that the Whittier who wrote "Massachusetts to Virginia," and "Our fellow-countrymen in chains," was not the Whittier who wrote "Lucy Hooper," and "The Merrimack?"

Digitized by Google

Beside our childhood's Merrimack,
I saw thy dark eye wander o'er
Stream, sunny upland, rocky shore,
And heard thy low soft voice alone
Midst lapse of water and the tone
Of pine-leaves by the west-wind blown.
There 's not a charm of soul or brow,—
  Of all we knew and lov'd in thee,—
But lives in holier beauty, now
  Baptized in immortality.

* * * * * * *

They 've laid thee midst the household graves
  Where father, brother, sister lie;
Below thee sweep the dark blue waves,
  Above thee bends the sky.
Thy own lov'd church in sadness read
Her solemn ritual o'er thy head,
And blessed and hallowed with her prayer
The turf laid lightly o'er thee there.
That church whose rites and liturgy
Sublime and old, were truth to thee,
Undoubted, to thy bosom taken
As symbols of a faith unshaken.
Even I, of simpler views, could feel
The beauty of thy trust and zeal;
And, owning not thy creed, could see
How deep a truth it seemed to thee,
And how thy fervent heart had thrown
O'er all a coloring of its own,
And kindled up, intense and warm,
A life in every rite and form,
As, when on Chebar's banks of old
The Hebrew's gorgeous vision rolled,
A spirit filled the vast machine—
A life 'within the wheels' was seen.
  Farewell! a little time, and we
  Who knew thee well, and loved thee here,
One after one shall follow thee
  As pilgrims through the gate of fear,
Which opens on eternity.
Yet shall we cherish not the less
  All that is left our hearts meanwhile;
The memory of thy loveliness
  Shall round our weary pathway smile,
Like moonlight when the sun has set—

Digitized by Google

A sweet and tender radiance yet;
Thoughts of thy clear-eyed sense of duty,
  Thy generous scorn of all things wrong,
The truth, the strength, the graceful beauty
  Which blended in thy song.
All lovely things, by thee beloved,
  Shall whisper to our hearts of thee;
These green hills where thy childhood roved,
  Yon river winding to the sea,
The sunset-light of autumn eves
  Reflecting on the deep still floods,
Cloud, crimson sky, and trembling leaves
  Of rain-bow tinted woods;
These, in our view, shall henceforth take
A tenderer meaning for thy sake,
And all thou lov'dst of earth and sky
Seem sacred to thy memory." pp. 345—348.

The geniality of his feelings is discernible also in the quality of his humor,—serious, yet pleasant, without a spice of bitterness. We recollect but one piece that is written throughout in this vein,—his "Demon of the Study," though there are several passages in which the latent shrewdness occasionally shines out on the surface, revealing the depth of good-nature whence the smile arose. See his description of the young clergyman-tourist at the White Mountains:—

"'Twas in truth a study,
To mark his spirit, alternating between
A decent and professional gravity
And an irreverent mirthfulness, which often
Laughed in the face of his divinity,
Plucked off the sacred ephod, quite unshrined
The oracle, and for the pattern priest
Left us the man." p. 11.

To review Whittier's Poems, without a notice of that remarkable and peculiar class of them which is directed against slavery, would be like playing "Othello," with the part of Othello left out "by particular request." In them he has taken a course distinctly his own, in which no one has followed him, as no one has had the strength of enthusiasm and imagination for the effort. In them we see the usually gentle, unobtrusive poet rapt into the mood of

Digitized by Google

an old Hebrew Seer, and, with all his fine powers strung to their utmost tension, standing forth to shake the nation with his message. We sometimes feel, especially in reading his "Massachusetts to Virginia," as if there were a spell given him to summon the very elements into the struggle against the spreading curse of our land; the winds, the waters, hills and vallies, and the monumental shafts of granite, seem to bear a part in the conflict, as the old gods joined in the fight around Ilium. He has made conceivable a poetic machinery that would agree with the spirit of modern ages, as the mythological suited the genius of ancient times. At all events, to use his own expressive language, he "scatters the living coals of truth upon the nation's naked heart." This is the work which these poems have done,—which they are still doing. They may indeed be rough here and there, their imagery may now and then be too gigantic for an exquisite's reading, some of their lines may be overstrained, and others may almost break down in the intermittent rush of thought; but one thing nobody will deny: they do their work. And as the author does not pamper feelings that are "too delicate for use," he will be content with the effect, whatever be the critic's censure. We have heard it alleged that these wonder-working strains are eloquent rather than poetic. But this is plainly a mistake. The faults as well as excellences they have, are those of poetry. Or, if it be true that "action, godlike action," is something "higher than eloquence," we may say that there is, in them, an element higher than poetry, and that the poetic faults are no faults, or dwindle into insignificance, when viewed in this higher relation. We must not forget, however, that the distinguishing qualities of his genius are found here, intensified in some cases, and in others held in abeyance by stronger forces. Nor must we fail to remark that it is only of the better pieces even of this class, that we speak. There are some of them in which a sarcastic wit is attempted, but we think with little success and with bad effect.

The anti-slavery poems have been so extensively read, that it seems rather gratuitous to quote examples. We take the following fragments from his "Massachusetts to Virginia;"—first observing that they were occasioned by

Digitized by Google

some "indignation-meetings" in the latter state on the refusal of the former to give up Latimer, the fugitive slave. The reader will mark an allusion to the Berkshire Address, the last public utterance, of Channing, who had recently died.

"The blast from Freedom's Northern hills, upon its Southern way,
Bears greeting to Virginia from Massachusetts-Bay:—
No word of haughty challenging, nor battle bugle's peal,
No steady tread of marching files, nor clang of horsemen's steel.

* * * * * * * *

"What means the Old Dominion? Hath she forgot the day
When o'er her conquered vallies swept the Briton's steel array,
How, side by side with sons of hers, the Massachusetts-men
Encountered Tarleton's charge of fire, and stout Cornwallis, then?

"Forgets she how the Bay-State, in answer to the call
Of her old House of Burgesses, spoke out from Faneuil Hall?
When, echoing back her Henry's cry, came pulsing on each breath
Of Northern winds, the thrilling cry of '*Liberty or Death.*'

* * * * * * * *

"A voice, from lips whereon the coal from Freedom's shrine hath been,
Thrilled, but as yesterday, the hearts of Berkshire's mountain men:
The echoes of that solemn voice are sadly lingering still
In all our sunny vallies, on every wind-swept hill.

"And when the prowling man-thief came hunting for his prey
Beneath the very shadow of Bunker's shaft of grey,
How, through the free lips of the son the father's warning spoke!
How, from its bonds of trade and sect the Pilgrim city broke!

"A hundred thousand right arms were lifted up on high,
A hundred thousand voices sent back their loud reply;—
Through the thronged towns of Essex the startling summons rang,
And up from bench and loom and wheel her young mechanics sprang;

"The voice of free, broad Middlesex, of thousands as of one,—
The shaft of Bunker calling to that of Lexington;
From Norfolk's ancient villages; from Plymouth's rocky bound,
To where Nantucket feels the arms of ocean close her round;

"From rich and rural Worcester,—where, through the calm repose
Of cultured vales and fringing woods the gentle Nashua flows,
To where Wachusett's wintry blasts the mountain larches stir,—
Swelled up to heaven the thrilling cry of '*God save Latimer!*'

"And sandy Barnstable rose up, wet with the salt sea-spray;
And Bristol sent her answering shout down Narragansett-Bay;
Along the broad Connecticut old Hampden felt the thrill;
And the cheer of Hampshire's woodmen swept down from Holyoke Hill:

Digitized by Google

"The voice of Massachusetts! of her free sons and daughters!
Deep calling unto Deep aloud,—the sound of many waters!
Against the burden of that voice what tyrant-power shall stand?—
'*No fetters in the Bay-State! No slave upon her land!*'

* * * * * * * *

"We wage no war, we lift no arm, we fling no torch within
The fire-damps of the quaking mine beneath your soil of sin;
We leave ye with your bondmen, to wrestle while ye can
With the strong upward tendencies and Godlike soul of man.

"But, for us and for our children, the vow which we have given
For Freedom and Humanity, is registered in heaven:-
'*No slave-hunt in our borders! No pirate on our strand!*
No fetters in the Bay-State! No slave upon our land!'"

pp. 188—191.

Of a more intense style in treating the same general subject, we give the following examples from another piece:—

"Our fellow-countrymen in chains!
Slaves, in a land of light and law!
Slaves, crouching on the very plains
Where rolled the storm of Freedom's war!
A groan from Eutaw's haunted wood,
A wail where Camden's martyrs fell,
By every shrine of patriot blood,
From Moultrie's wall, and Jasper's well!

"By storied hill and hallowed grot,
By mossy wood, and marshy glen,
Where rang of old the rifle-shot
And hurrying shout of Marion's men,—
The groan of breaking hearts is there,
The falling lash, the fetter's clank;
Slaves, slaves are breathing in that air
Which old De Kalb and Sumter drank.

* * * * * * * * * * *

"Shall Belgium feel—and gallant France,
By Vendôme's pile, and Schönbrunn's wall,
And Poland gasping on her lance—
The impulse of our cheering call?
And shall the slave, beneath our eye,
Clank o'er our fields his hateful chain,
And toss his fettered arms on high,
And groan for Freedom's gift in vain?

Digitized by Google

"Oh say, shall Prussia's banner be
A refuge for the stricken slave?
And shall the Russian serf go free
By Baikal's lake and Neva's wave?
And shall the wintry-bosomed Dane
Relax the iron-hand of pride,
And bid his bondmen cast the chain
From fettered soul and limb aside?

"Shall every flap of England's flag
Proclaim that all around are free
From 'farthest Ind' to each blue crag
That beetles o'er the Western sea?
And shall we scoff at Europe's kings,
When Freedom's fire is dim with us,
And round our country's altar clings
The damning shade of Slavery's curse?"

pp. 133—135.

We close with an extract in a different tone. It is from an ode written at Washington, 1845, and expresses the author's confidence in the spirit of Freedom now latent at the South:—

"Nay, my words are all too sweeping:
In this crowded human mart
Feeling is not dead, but sleeping;
Man's strong will, and woman's heart,
In the coming strife for Freedom, yet shall bear their generous part.

"And from yonder sunny vallies
Southward in the distance lost,
Freedom yet shall summon allies
Worthier than the North can boast,—
With the Evil, by their hearth-stones, grappling at severer cost.

"Now, the soul alone is willing:
Faint the heart, and weak the knee;
And, as yet, no lip is thrilling
With the mighty words '*Be free!*'
Tarrieth long the land's Good Angel,—but his advent is to be."

p. 211.

We intended to conclude with some general views respecting the nature of true poetry, and with some strictures on certain theories which we have seen upon the

Digitized by Google

subject. But, except in so far as they may be gathered from what we have incidentally said, they must be suppressed for want of room. We have only to add that, with a very high opinion of Whittier's genius, and with the fullest admiration of his own taste, we still must admit that he is quite unequal. He does not always sustain himself, through want of effort as it appears to us. There are pieces, too, in which we think the measure unfortunate. This is the case especially with those composed of triplets; since the monotonous recurrence of these does not allow sufficient scope for harmony of verse, or for variety of expression. And again: has he, at all times, confidence enough in himself to follow his own bent without being drawn aside by examples from abroad? We mean the question in no bad sense. Let him be assured, that there is no one in America, and no one at present in Europe, from whom he either needs, or can obtain, help, except in the way of general culture. As a poet, let him, above all things, preserve unsophisticated his rich fund of native gifts,—his manly truthfulness, his freshness of conception, his clear strong "objectivity," his immediate communion with nature, and his directness of expression. These are above all praise. Any refinement that should in the least impair these, would be false refinement, let it be sanctioned by whatsoever examples it may. If a little more polish be acquired in the course of practice, it will at least be no disadvantage, and a rigorous use of the pruning-knife may bring out a more beautiful growth; but let neither file nor knife touch the vital parts.

H. B.[2d.]

Article XII.

The Divine Law, and Divine Justice.

However uninviting the subject to those who covet a reputation for originality, every investigation concerning the divine law and divine justice, has at least the inter-

Digitized by Google

est of importance. For the determinate ideas respecting the law and justice of God, are the basis, or rather the controlling principle, in every system of theology. And the prevailing theology, with respect to this subject, exerts a wide and powerful influence, in civil, legislative and judicatory systems, making them lenient, or severe. Theology is indeed the determining essence of all human means for the restriction of vice and crime. So that the spirit of the one being benevolence, the administration and character of the other will be mild and reformatory. And if one be founded on the idea of retaliative justice, and if by this idea it explains the divine government, legislation will attempt to copy; and will exhibit a result no less revolting to reason and humanity than is presented in the past history of civilization. Identified with this subject, then, are all the combined interests of a true theology, and a correct administration of the means designed to prevent crime.

It is necessary to remark, with regard to the method and design of the following investigation, that every essence contains in itself the idea of its consequences and end. From the nature of law, we deduce its design and mode of fulfilment. So, also, from the nature of justice, are infered its legitimate results, as well as the character and extent of its demands. We first determine the essence, therefore, from which to deduce the conclusion. And the conclusion, which it is designed to establish in these remarks, is the harmony of our subject with infinite goodness, and with the salvation of man. Striving to use the caution demanded by the importance of this subject, and holding due respect for the opinions of others, we proceed now in our inquiry.

The term law, in its most extensive application, has been defined, "a rule of action." In this sense, it applies to every possible exertion of power, and signifies the mode or manner in which that power operates. From this general definition, the correctness of which but few will question, it is evident that every law must be inseparably connected with the power which is governed by it. The laws of a machine, being the fixed modes of action for the powers which move the machine, cannot be separated from those powers. We cannot conceive the laws of nature to be distinct from nature's energies, but to belong to

Digitized by Google

them. Every law, therefore, while it is a rule of action for some agent, must exist in and with the agent which acts. If the divine law is a rule of action for man, its original, actual essence must reside in man, and cannot be conceived distinctly from his being. It may be represented on "tables of stone," on the page of inspiration, or be proclaimed by the voice of Omnipotence from the burning Mount; it may be converged into the significant sentence, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself;" but its actual reality is found only as conjoined with the powers of human nature. Nor will this conclusion appear problematical, when it is considered that every truth, relating to man's moral nature, must have a correlative existing in that nature, as a necessary condition of the supposed relation. The revealed law of God must have an appreciating, responsive element, whose existence in our moral being is presupposed.

Proceeding, then, on this conclusion, it remains to identify this correlative in man. And here the law of conscience is immediately suggested, as the object sought. But whether conscience be the result of experience, as some suppose, or the absolute intuition of reason, it must, in either case, be imperfect, since experience is not now perfect, nor reason fully developed. This supposition, however, is not applicable to the "perfect law of God." And what is conclusive against the claims of conscience, in this respect, it is a *perception* of the law, rather than the essence itself. It is necessary, therefore, to go beyond and deeper than conscience. But without descending to a rigorous and tedious analysis of this point, it is obvious that all moral powers, have legitimate and definite modes of action. These modes are the laws of our moral nature. And it is by obedience to these, that man realizes his true destiny; or it is in the violation of them, that we become subjects of guilt, and need salvation. The same, precisely, is true of the revealed law. By perfect obedience to this, also, man attains to his true destiny; and he fails to do this, by violation of the law of God. Now, therefore, since we cannot attain our legitimate end, by two *different* modes and courses of conduct, by obedience to two *dissimilar* laws, the identity of the moral laws of man, with the divine law, is clearly established. Indeed,

Digitized by Google

it is necessary to suppose that the truth expressed in the revealed law has an actual existence somewhere. And where?—unless in the constitution of those powers, of which it is a rule of action. Regarding, then, the divine law, and the laws of our moral being, as the same in reality and essence, the revealed designed simply to awaken a perception of the actual, and both identical in their ultimate results and consequences, we proceed to investigate the mode of their fulfilment, and the character as well as extent of their demands.

With regard to the fulfilment of God's law, the subject is briefly expounded by the Apostle Paul: "Love worketh no ill to the neighbor; therefore, love is the fulfilling of the law." To love thy neighbor as thyself, is to fulfil the divine law. But there needs no proof that a person doing thus would obey the laws of his moral nature—that one cannot thus love his neighbor, unless he does obey those laws; and *vice versa.* Obedience, therefore, to the laws of man's moral nature, is the fulfilment of God's law. In fact, what is more rational and evident, than that obedience to any law, is the legitimate mode of fulfilling it?

Now it is, that the *demands* of the law, present an important subject of investigation. And it is believed that theology has materially misconceived, with respect to this matter; that, misapprehending the character and subject of its demands, theology has wrongly interpreted the law, in its supposed relations to the punishment of sin. And it is suggested, that even the more liberal thinkers of the day, having yielded in a degree to older impressions, have raised false issues, with regard to the amount of that punishment due to transgression. That the divine law asks to be fulfilled, or, which is the same thing, asks to be obeyed, may not be a question. In case man violates it, however, the question arises, whether it demands, in satisfaction, the *endless* punishment of the transgressor, or whether this punishment contemplates the ultimate good of the subject, and is hence not endless. In relation to this issue, it might be suggested here, that God has not attached such a penalty to his own law as contravenes his own desires with respect to the final destiny of his own offspring. But a moment's reflection upon this point, will enable us to

Digitized by Google

perceive, that God has attached no penalty to his law; and that it can have no demands, with respect to the punishment of sin. For it is evident that every law is instituted with the sole end of accomplishing the original design of the powers governed by it. Its design is simply to carry out their design, and is wholly subservient to this object. Thus the revealed law was a "schoolmaster," a guide and teacher, to lead us to Christ. Such being the end of every law, its demands must be compatible with that end—must aim wholly at the accomplishment of the first design of the agent subject to the law. And this without reverting to the past; for a violation of law, in no way changes the design for which it was instituted. Suppose, then, that man violates the divine law—the laws of his moral nature. Since it was ordained for the future good of man, since its design regards only that good, after as well as before it is violated, the law cannot refer retrospectively to what man may have been in the past, but prospectively to what he is designed to become in the future—is designed to become by the aid of this very law. How, then, can the law of God demand a satisfaction for past violations? By what process of reasoning shall we attach a penalty to it, when a penalty is something suffered as due to sin already committed? If the agent, for whose end the law was instituted, fulfils that law at last, by obedience to it, and thus accomplishes the original design, what more does the law require? If the divine law was ordained with the view to man's salvation from sin, and this salvation arises out of man's perfect obedience, it can ask only this obedience; for the object of it,—the contemplated good of man, is thus attained. The demands of God's law, therefore, respect simply its fulfilment by obedience to it. And that love to the neighbor, which worketh to him no ill, is at once "the fulfilling of the law," and a satisfaction of its demands.

But it is a question worthy of notice here, whether God's law may not attach to itself a penalty, involving the punishment of sin, as a preventive of future violations,—whether it may not demand a sufficient retribution to operate as a means of effecting its own end, and the good of the creature. In answer, it may be remarked, that a *means* to prevent future transgression, is very different

Digitized by Google

from something *due* on account of the past. If this means is demanded, it is in consideration of a future good, not of a past evil. And this idea, it is perceived, does not correspond with that of a penalty.

But to satisfy the mind fully upon this point, it is necessary to account for that punishment which every man feels he experiences as the result of sin, on some other hypothesis than the satisfaction and demands of God's law. For the purpose of illustration, then, let it be supposed that the laws of health are violated. The effect is sickness, pain, and perhaps death. These consequences may teach us wisdom, and serve to prevent future violations. But can it be said that the laws of health *demand* these effects, as a preventive? Or is it not the violation which causes them; while at the same time those laws are striving to prevent them? It is obvious, that the laws of health continually resist disease, instead of demanding it, as well after as before transgression. So with respect to the divine law. It being violated, the effect is moral death; but the law nevertheless continually resists this death. And can it demand what it strenuously opposes? It is therefore the *sin* which causes, not the *law* which requires, the effect; for all its energies are directed to the removal of moral disease, the moment it is generated. That which to man appears punishment, is the effect of his own wrong—his own evil; and though this punishment has a reformatory tendency, it is a virtue attached, by a wise and merciful Providence, to what otherwise would appear an absolute evil, in the developement of moral natures. In whatever light we view the divine law, then, it cannot be regarded as having any demands, except those comprehended in the idea of its fulfilment by obedience to it; and this idea embraces that of man's salvation from sin. So that it is emphatically true of him, who "taketh away the sin of the world," that he "came not to destroy the law, but to fulfil." It demands not that punishment shall be inflicted because there is sin, but in order that there shall be *no* sin—that its design shall be realized in the accomplishment of man's legitimate destiny. "For all the law is fulfilled in one word, even in this: Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

We are now prepared to contemplate that most dreaded

Digitized by Google

of all Jehovah's attributes, divine justice. And it is believed that this universal sentiment of dread, characterizing our conceptions of justice, does not only flow from those extreme results which theology has deduced from this attribute of Deity, but from mistaken views of its very nature,—views which the more liberal theologian has not as yet discarded. That supposed quality of divine justice, which more particularly concerns this investigation, is what has been termed its *remunerative* and *punitive* principles. Remunerative justice is a distribution of rewards for good; punitive or vindictive justice is the infliction of punishment as due to the sins of men. There is, then, according to general opinion, a quality belonging to this attribute of the Deity, which awards a certain good as the merit of righteousness, and a certain amount of punishment as a satisfaction for sin. That divine justice is neither remunerative nor vindictive, is evident from the following considerations: First, it being an attribute of God, it is eternal in all its essential qualities, and cannot depend upon any contingencies as a condition of its existence. Secondly, that which is a necessary condition of these *supposed* qualities, is the existence of good and evil, as applied to created finite beings. But before the date of finite moral existence, this condition did not exist. Divine justice, therefore, is in so much denied its acknowledged eternity. No punitive quality can belong to this attribute of God, that does not suppose evil and sin as its logical antecedent. Evil, however, must have had a beginning—a supposition which cannot apply to any essential quality of God's justice. And with respect to the remunerative principle also, good, considered of Deity, is to be sure eternal. But it will be difficult to find, even here, the necessary condition of remunerative justice. For whatever happiness and reward God possesses, are the natural result of all his combined and infinite perfections, rather than the award of any individual attribute. It is proper to remark, also, that the supposed qualities are obviously antagonistical to well known principles of the Gospel. The idea of evil for evil, "an eye for an eye," was repudiated by Christ, and that of good for evil, love toward enemies, represented as an attainment of Christian character, which alone corresponded with the perfections of

Digitized by Google

our Father in heaven. But it is impossible to conceive the award of punishment, either limited or unlimited, as a satisfaction for past sins, as something demanded on account of something already done, in any other light than that of "evil for evil." Or, if that punishment be considered a reformative means, it regards not the past, but the future only; and hence becomes a providence of God, instead of a punitive demand of his justice. With regard to remunerative justice also, if, according to the usual views, it awards good for good, it may be replied that for evil too good is rendered; and thus divine justice is either opposed to the doctrine of good for evil, or makes no distinction in its awards between vice and virtue. But would it not be well to seek some other hypothesis of rewards and punishments, now, than that of justice? And such will be no difficult task, it is anticipated, when once the essential qualities of this divine attribute are truly conceived.

In the ultimate design, satisfaction, and fulfilment of God's law, reposes the idea of divine justice; and whatever be the final results of the law, such results will constitute the expression and accomplishment of justice. If the former result in the endless happiness of the righteous, and endless misery of the wicked, this will represent the idea of the latter, and be in accordance with it. But the design contemplated in the law is universal love to the neighbor; arising out of its fulfilment by obedience to it. Out of a state of universal love to the neighbor, therefore, would arise a co-extensive distribution and accomplishment of divine justice. And it is through the law, as a criterion leading directly to it, that this attribute of God expresses itself on the face of the moral creation.

To give the idea in few words, then, divine justice is that perfect harmony which flows from the operation of all the powers of Deity, in accordance with their eternal and perfect laws. This, imaged forth in the moral universe, would be that state resulting from the obedience of all beings therein, to the legitimate laws of their own existence; without, at the same time, infringing upon the laws and rights of each other. Thus it is seen that obedience to the laws of moral natures, while it produces the love contemplated in the fulfilment of God's law, leads

Digitized by Google

directly to the accomplishment of justice. It is by exceeding individual rights, thus causing deprivation on the part of others, that injustice prevails among men. And it needs no exemplification to show that such deprivations can exist only where the law is not obeyed, and love to the neighbor is wanting. It will be perceived, also, that in accordance with this idea of divine justice, is the aim of civil jurisprudence; for it seeks, according to certain rules and methods, to secure the rights of all, and thus attempts to enforce obedience to what is neither more nor less than the principle of love to the neighbor. Criminal jurisprudence, however, as now existing, has little foundation in justice; but is based upon the providence and wisdom of men. It aims at the prevention of crime, and protection of society, by administering deprivations and injustice to the offender.

But it is necessary briefly to consider the relations of God's justice to good and evil. Here, nearly the same argument applies, that was suggested in our remarks upon the demands of the law. Divine justice contemplates, in the idea of its accomplishment, that state of moral powers which would result from universal obedience to the laws of moral existence. In order to realize itself, this state of spiritual harmony and love, which worketh no ill to the neighbor, is that which justice continually seeks; and all its demands have regard to this grand end. With respect to sin, therefore, it does not ask punishment, as a satisfaction for itself, but simply that sin shall not exist. It looks toward the future, and does not revert to the past. While the law is transgressed, while a being lives in discordant relations to moral laws, so long are injustice and its concomitant miseries continued, and the contemplated end of divine justice is delayed. We conclude, then, that the relations of justice to evil and its resulting miseries, are entirely of a negative character. It deems sin, and also the effects of sin, as repugnant to itself. The relation of this attribute of God to good and the reward of goodness, may be perceived from the following. Man exists, that his Creator may impart to him happiness. This is imparted according to certain laws, obedience to which is a necessary condition of enjoying it. When man performs this condition, the happiness re-

Digitized by Google

sulting is called the reward of virtue. And yet, that benevolent design which first brought man into being for the purpose of this enjoyment, is that which demands the reward, so called, that the design itself may be realized. Obedience to the divine law, and thus doing justice, is therefore merely a necessary condition of receiving the happiness God imparts, as the end for which he created man. It is the original design of man—or rather, the divine benevolence which conceived the design,—that demands the good he enjoys. Universal obedience to the law, and a co-extensive justice, were merely that condition and means, by which infinite goodness purposed to impart good to the innumerable beings it has brought into existence. And when the divine law shall finally realize its utmost design and fulfilment, in the obedience to it by all beings in whom there exists its responsive original element, then, as arising from this, divine justice will have reflected itself upon all moral creatures. And the condition of universal happiness thus attained, the benevolent design of man shines forth in all the grandeur, height, and depth of the original idea. Such, it is believed, are the final results contemplated in the law and justice of God—subjects which have been interpreted most unfavorably for man, who is wont to look at them in a light not more derogatory to the character of a Being infinitely good, than productive of present misery to those whose end is to "delight in the law of God," regarding "justice and judgment as the habitation of his throne."

In the mean time, however, sin and its accompaniments appear on the surface of things, not as that which moral powers seek as their end, not as an absolute, unmixed evil, nor yet as holding other relations to God's law and justice, than as dross to the chemical principles according to which it is separated from the pure metal. It appears as something foreseen by the Creator, in the original conception of human ends, and by him controlled into harmony with those ends. It is in the full conviction, that misery inevitably flows as the effect of sin, that happiness is conditioned by virtue, justice, and obedience to moral laws, and may be attained in its fulness and truth, that man will separate himself from evil, and seek to realize the idea of his existence.

Digitized by Google

Having now, so far illustrated the harmony of this subject with infinite goodness, and the salvation of man, as limited opportunities for bestowing thought upon it would admit, it is hoped the reader will find sufficient interest here, to induce a charitable criticism upon the style and medium through which the ideas have been expressed. If these remarks, perhaps erroneously conceived in some respects, shall commend themselves to the judgment as true in the main, and present a better view of our relations to God, or make it appear that the reforming spirit of the age is not a subversion of justice and moral laws, but a gradual unfolding of their eternal principles,—in a word, if they shall contribute to a theology more truthful, and to a system of criminal laws mild and reformatory in tendency,—the writer's design will be fully realized, and his pains amply rewarded. O. D. M.

Note by the Editor. We insert this article, not as presenting our own views of the subject, but as an ingenious systematic expression of the philosophy which we suppose to be held, either wholly or in part, by some of our most distinguished writers. To us this philosophy appears, when fully carried out, to conflict with those laws of our moral nature, by which sin is followed by guilt,—a retrospective self-condemning cognizance; and indeed, by setting aside the fact of merit and demerit, to deny the reality of moral principles as distinguished from mere sensuous emotions. We think the theory would legitimately resolve itself into the naked utilitarian hypothesis.

Article XIII.

The Seared Conscience.

That men differ in their moral nature, as well as in their intellectual, few close observers of the phenomena of human actions will be disposed to question. The difference in both departments is manifest enough to every one who will stop to take note of it. One individual has

Digitized by Google

stronger and clearer mental faculties than another. So one has stronger and more active moral faculties than another. Of course the character and results of action, in both cases, will differ accordingly. Take the intellectual department: The superior in intellect will soonest discover a philosophical or scientific truth, and more deeply appreciate its value and enjoy its beauty. So, on the contrary, he will soonest be offended with an error of calculation, and hurt by any blunder in the process of demonstration. He is quick to detect, and quick to feel in this respect.

But the inferior intellect, unlike this, is incapable of reaching up to this higher class of scientific facts; and, of course, is not greatly offended by any error in its attempts at demonstration, or hurt by its failure to comprehend the principles involved in the inquiry. The very inability to comprehend, to grasp the subject in all its greatness, exempts it from the poignant feeling, the intense disappointment, which the superior intellect would experience, knowing, as it does, the importance of the inquiry, and seeing its manifold relations, if successfully prosecuted, to other probable discoveries.

So in the moral department: The first, with more perfect developement, with highly active moral powers, and having a clearer perception of right and wrong, will be quickly disturbed and hurt by any transgression of the law of right; and will, on the other hand, as highly enjoy every act of moral obedience, and welcome with purest pleasure every good deed done in the name of God or man. The pain of the wrong, and the joy of the right, are both great.

But the second, whose moral developement is of an inferior order, and his moral sense less delicate and active, will neither enjoy as much from obedience, nor suffer as much from disobedience. A bad deed, an act of cruelty, a violation of the laws of justice, truth or purity, will not fill him with such horror and pain, as it did the first named. He cannot feel so strongly; the shock is not so great to his moral sense, or conscience, for the reason given—it is not so full and powerfully alive in him. But, on the other hand, to balance this, this imperfect or weaker moral sense loses him an equal amount of enjoyment

Digitized by Google

from a good act, a deed of mercy, a sublime self-sacrifice whether his own or another's. He knows nothing of the thrill of delight, the unspeakable satisfaction, which gladdens the soul of the former, when doing or witnessing, such divine actions.

It will be seen, therefore, by the careful inquirer, that there is a manifest compensation in both cases, and that the balance of justice is held with an equal hand. And this truth of moral science, demonstrated by the facts of daily experience and observation, furnishes a key to the well-known circumstance, that the best and most conscientious suffer far more for any wrong they may do, than the most wicked and depraved. This doubtless is as it should be, and is in accordance with the principle just set forth. If the man whose moral faculties are of a higher order, who is gifted with a quick sense and clear perception of what is right and what is wrong, whose conscience distinctly warns him against it—if he, notwithstanding all this, persists in doing the wrong, he ought to suffer more than another, whose moral sense is less quick, whose conscience speaks feebly and indistinctly, and who, therefore of necessity, sees the wrong less clearly, and feels it less strongly. This is on the ever-just principle, that he who knows his Master's will and does it not, shall be beaten with many stripes; while he who knows it not and does it not, shall be beaten with few only.

Nothing can be more reasonable than this; for that, where this difference in the moral capacities and perceptions of men exist, there is also a like difference in the measure of moral responsibility and guilt, is obvious to every one who is capable of reasoning or thinking. And where there is such a difference in the measure of moral responsibility and guilt, there should be, of course, a corresponding difference in the measure of punishment. Otherwise there would be the grossest injustice, and an unpardonable violation of all acknowledged principles of a righteous government. This very fact, therefore, which is often cited to disprove the equal and just awards of conscience, as the minister of heaven, in the present life, is most convincing proof to the contrary; and illustrates, to all, the nice precision with which the moral machinery of human nature works to the production of its manifold

Digitized by Google

results, and shows the unalterable rectitude and justice with which God rules in the affairs of men.

But let us turn now to the question, whether the conscience can be seared, or wholly deadened, by repeated abuse and sin; whether the measure of moral sense originally given, be it more or less, can be utterly obliterated, destroyed, so as to take no cognizance of wrong, and suffer no pain from its commission?

That the conscience may be partially blunted, for a time, by repeated injuries and violations, is a fact in ethical history which no one is disposed to dispute. And that, when the power of conscience is thus weakened, and the moral faculties are in this condition of partial paralysis or slumber, the transgressor suffers less immediate pain from any act of wrong—this also no careful thinker will be inclined to deny. But, because this is allowed, therefore to take it for proved that man's moral nature can by transgression be entirely crushed out of existence, as though it had not been; to jump from this comparative fact to the absolute conclusion that the conscience may be utterly annihilated, reduced to a perfectly dead body, having no resurrection to life in this world—this seems to be an overleaping of all laws of sound reasoning; and a contradiction alike of the established facts of human experience, and the uniform witness of God's holy word.[1]

There can be no such thing, however the outward conduct of transgressors may seem to indicate it; however much themselves may be disposed to assert it in mere bravado, or even at times, perhaps, to think so from its inactivity and seeming stupor. Nothing is more false

[1] 1 Timothy iv. 2. "Having their consciences seared with a hot iron." This phrase is taken from the practice of branding criminals with a hot iron on some conspicuous part of the body, as a punishment and a shame. This was not done with a view to deaden the part branded, but only that they might be known as criminals, and exposed to merited odium. The apostle, in the context, is warning his brethren against certain false teachers; and, among other marks by which they may be known, mentions this of the seared or branded conscience. The expression is of course employed in a figurative manner. They were religious criminals, teaching "doctrines of devils, speaking lies in hypocrisy;" and these things show that God, the Master and Ruler of all, has seared or branded their consciences with the mark of the criminal, that they may be known and avoided.

Digitized by Google

than such a supposition, as after experience on the one hand, and observation on the other, have abundantly and painfully demonstrated. The sinner may harden his feelings by repeated wrong and crime; he may be deaf to the voice of conscience, or pass her warnings unheeded amid the clamor of appetite and the excitement of passion and its gratification; and, as said, he may even think she is wholly silenced and dead, and that he shall have no more trouble or pain from her interference; and others, judging from his wild and reckless career, may think so too, and argue that his moral nature is completely blasted and destroyed—but it is a mistaken conclusion, and to the sinner himself who acts upon it, a fearful and fatal one. He has no power to commit such murder on his conscience. He may desire it, and may repeat his efforts again and again to accomplish it; but in vain. It is immortal, and laughs to scorn his wild and maniac attempts to crush it. And, sooner or later, it will arouse from its passive scorn, and in active vengeance make terrible reprisals for all these insults and injuries.

And when this day of judgment comes, it inflicts retribution for all the accumulated wrong of the past: the wrong which the sinner flattered himself was done with impunity, done without an equivalent of pain or remorse. When awaked to judgment it takes ample vengeance for all the transgressions committed while it slept, or was thought to have slept. And it will be found in this day of account, that nothing has escaped its watch, nor the slightest offence been forgotten, however stupified and dead it might have seemed during that dismal night of sin and crime. Now that the awful hour of trial has arrived, and the shuddering wretch stands face to face with this inexorable judge, every wrong act, every unrighteous purpose or feeling, every idle word, must be reckoned for, and its consequences met. And when, or where, or how this judgment may be ushered in, none can tell. The slightest thing, as well as the most important, may open the way for it. A change of circumstances, the approach of death, misfortune, sickness, the loss of a friend, a dream, a word or look, a tone of the voice, a strain of music, or a sudden rush of memory, each may have the power to summon the trembling wretch to trial, power to break the vials of wrath on his defenceless soul.

Digitized by Google

Yes, nothing is truer than this—that not even the most depraved and hardened criminal can dethrone or destroy conscience, or escape her just and certain retributions. No searing will deprive it of its vital power. Nay, it will take vengeance for this very searing itself. Truly says the New York Evangelist, "The seared conscience will be avenged. Sometimes she rouses herself amidst the agonies of DERANGEMENT. The sinner pursues his career of depravity until some physical result on himself, or some dreadful effect on others, destroys the balance of his mind. Some fearful form then comes up before him. Menacing shades darken his vision. Conscience, let loose from her burning chains, riots in the wilderness and tempests of the imagination. She paints on the canvass of the soul the imagery of ruin and wrath. She forces to the tongue words of awful import, and darts from the eye glances of thrilling fierceness. We need not mention individual cases in proof. The tales of derangement, as the consequence of sin, are too well known to require any particular description.

"Sometimes too conscience awakens in the hour of dissolution. Terrible scenes have been witnessed at the death-bed. The soul, about to depart, utters some piercing cry; makes some dark confession; and hangs shuddering" over the dark abyss of death. "Weary and haggard aspects belong to that dread hour. Darkness settles upon all the agitated muscles of the face. The light within—the irradiating soul that once breathed lustre upon them all—now breathes out only to blacken. The energy which from her still issues through every wonted avenue, is now visible only as the smoke of her torment. Conscience is enthroned within, burning up the wilful delusions by which she has been surrounded. The eternal fire is kindled, and amid the paleness of the dying, it shoots its horrible radiations. The tone of man's voice then shows that a demon-hand is meddling with the harp-strings within."

True words are these, and worthy of the serious thought of all tempted souls, of all who have entered on the path of sin in the vain expectation of escape. Let no one think, because the bolt does not fall at once, that therefore there is no lightning in the black clouds above him. How-

Digitized by Google

ever it may linger, it will surely come at last; and when it comes, the fiery crash will show that it has not lost, but gathered, terribleness by its delay. How many have witnessed to this, who, after ten, and even twenty, years of concealment, have at last been driven by the horrors of an awakened conscience to confess their crimes! And the American Tract Society, gathering as it does the results of experience and observation from so many thousand sources, bears righteous and solemn testimony to this point (*Tract* No. 418.) in the following: "Conscience is the great betrayer of secret sin. It would seem to be one of the laws of God's moral government, that the apprehensions and forebodings of the mind under the influence of remorse should, sooner or later, force the offender to the confession of his own guilt, and to be the publisher of his own shame. No vigor of intellect, no strength of nerve, no sworn purpose of secresy is able to withstand the urgent pressure of an incensed conscience. When God commands her to speak, she will speak, and *speak out* to the confusion of the worker of iniquity. Nothing can suppress the outward murmurings of that inward condemnation which the terrified mind feels when bleeding, writhing under the agonies of an accusing conscience. You can clothe yourself with no splendor of which conscience will not divest you; you can enter no solitude where conscience will not follow you; conscience will make you pale on your lonely pillow; and even in your soundest slumber she will whisper, 'Thou art the man.'"

How often has this been verified in all ages of the world. Look at Tiberius, emperor of Rome, clothed in all the splendor, surrounded with all the luxuries and enjoyments and honors, which wealth and power could procure; and then read his letter to the Senate, and what Tacitus says, and judge whether this witness is not true. Even with his rage and cruelty there mixed a terror inexplicable and irresistible; and amid the wildest uproar of passion and crime, the fierce and shuddering cry of remorse and horror was lifted up. And at times, when the violence of excitement was past, and he sought the refuge of his chamber, fearful and bloody spectres swept through his imagination, and held their dance of death in the desolate solitudes of his soul. And again, sometimes in the midst of

Digitized by Google

his beastly revelries, conscience roused up suddenly, and hurled down her volcanic fires, hot and hissing, on his naked heart, until he howled aloud in agony! So little protection does wealth, or place, or power afford against the retributions of an outraged moral nature—so impossible is it to escape the flaming arrows which a violated conscience, sooner or later, deals in the face of the transgressor.

And he who enters upon the path of wrong and sin, and is encouraged to proceed because he finds conscience less troublesome than he expected as he advances,—he will be wise if he gives heed to this universal witness, and turns upon his steps in good time. If he do not, in an hour when he thinks not, the avenger will arise in her wrath, and burst upon his quaking soul in judgment and terror, in anguish and despair unspeakable. Better be taught by the experience of others. Better hasten away before it is too late. They who are trusting to this temporary calm for permanent security against the vengeance of an offended conscience, of a wronged and violated moral nature, are like those peasants and vine-dressers who plant themselves on the sides of Vesuvius and Ætna. It is green and fertile all about them; their houses stand firm; and the long silence and quiet of the mountain has hushed their fears, and they feel themselves safe from danger and death. But suddenly, on some fair bright day, when all is still, and they are dreaming only of comfort and happiness, the earth, without a moment's warning, begins trembling and cracking under their feet; the air is filled with ashes and cinders, and the awful roar of the volcano breaks upon them. They fly with cries of alarm, with mutual intreaties for help—but it is too late. The flaming tempest breaks forth from the summit. Down the mountain's side, over precipices, through rivers and ravines, rushes, leaping and hissing, the wild wide lava flood; and, bursting on its shuddering victims, sweeps them, their cottages and vineyards, flocks and herds, and every living and green thing, beneath its awful tide of fiery death.

So it is with the evil doer, with the criminal who trusts to a "seared conscience" for impunity. He is dwelling on the side of a volcano. It may be green now, and quiet—but the flaming flood is beneath his feet, and when he

Digitized by Google

least looks for it, it will come bursting up in overwhelming wreck and ruin.

But let us look at the question, now, from another standpoint. Suppose the position assumed in the foregoing argument is not defensible, and the common doctrine of the "seared conscience" is true. Suppose we should allow that the conscience may be deadened, and the moral sense entirely extinguished. Would the sinner fare any better in this case? Would he escape all punishment for his wrong? Far from this. It might be granted in such case, that he would suffer little or no positive pain for his evil deeds; but it would be a hasty conclusion that he, therefore, suffered no punishment. If the moral sense is *dead*, then nothing is enjoyed morally! And think how large a share of the highest blessedness of the human soul is due to the ministry of the moral faculties. If the conscience has ceased to act, its penalties may cease, but also its rewards; suffering may be escaped, but how immeasurable the loss of enjoyment which, from this source, flows like a river of life into the soul of the good man! How many avenues of happiness are closed up. How many holy sympathies, how many beautiful memories, how many delicate sensibilities, lie crushed and dead, which once brought such rich and welcome offerings to the altar of the heart, ere its fire had gone out and left it cold and dark.

And then if conscience is dead, memory is not. Childhood with its pure emotions, its freshness of feeling, its bright picturings of the future; youth with its glorious promise, its high hopes, its holy love and trust—all these memory brings back to him; and, with unspeakable desolateness of feeling, he looks back over the wild and dreary waste that stretches between him and those golden days of the early time. He knows the deadness of feeling which has come over him, and mournfully contrasts it with the lively emotions, the tenderness of heart, and the quick pure pleasure that made the very pulse of life at that happy period. But now his heart is like a desolate ruin; the moss and the ivy have crept all over its crumbling walls, and the whir of the wheeling bat, and the hooting of the owl, make the only music heard in its lone and deserted halls. His conscience is dead; his heart is dead; and life itself a dismal and voiceless wilderness. There are no thorns

Digitized by Google

nor briars there, but there are no flowers, nor shrubs, not even a blade of grass, not one green thing to redeem its utter barrenness and desolation. He cannot suffer; he cannot enjoy; he cannot feel. His sensibilities are all palsied; his soul is encased in ice. Suffering itself would be a blessing; the quick agony which shows the presence of life would be welcomed—any thing to break up this awful silence and deadness. But no: it will not come. Conscience, the heart, the moral nature, is like a dark, dead sea, walled in by everlasting mountains, overshadowed by dense forests, whose sluggish waters never wake to the voice of the storm, or smile beneath the kisses of the sun!

And this is the condition of him whose moral life has been destroyed by repeated sin. This is the awful price paid for a dead conscience! for the frightful privilege of escaping her quick judgements for wrong. Who would desire such a pre-eminence of evil? Who would not rather say: "Great God, if I am to sin, leave me my living active conscience. Let me feel her fiery arrows for every wrong, rather than this moral deadness, this utter desolation of soul."

In this view of the subject, it is amazing that any one can argue, or imagine, that the "seared conscience" is a present favor to the sinner, because it enables him to sin without suffering. It is matter of wonder that such do not see that this is in itself an awful punishment, an incalculable loss; that this wide and barren waste, this silent, unbroken solitude of the soul is more dreadful than any thing that could come of the stings of conscience; which are themselves signs of vitality, welcome evidence that the moral pulse is not yet frozen up, that there is life and hope still.

In regard to no other like calamity would they be so blind, or reason so falsely. Who would be foolish and mad enough to cut off his right hand, because it gave him pain when he thrust it into the fire? Who would wish his tongue torn from his throat, because it sometimes hurried him into rash and hurtful speech? What transgressor of the organic laws amputates his foot, because the gout, which his physical sin has brought on, wrings and wrenches it with sharpest agony? The dead tongue, or hand, or

Digitized by Google

foot would indeed give no pain; but the loss of them would be a greater evil than the pain. The silent tongue would secure us from the sorrow of hasty and imprudent speech; but it would also deprive us of all the pleasures of conversation, and all the advantages of a prompt expression of our thoughts, feelings and wishes. The dead hand would cause us no suffering, however often thrust into the flame; but then it would not handle for us, and in a thousand unthought of ways we should miss its ready service. The dead foot would no more inflict its fierce torture for our excesses; but also it would no more help us to walk; it would give us no more wanderings along the busy streets, no more rambles over hill and valley, through pleasant woods, and by murmuring streams.

So it is possible that one might look at the burning sun at noon, until he should destroy the sight of his eyes, and become totally blind. To say nothing of the pain of such a process, it may be granted that after this he might turn his sightless eyes to the meridian sun or any dazzling light, without suffering any inconvenience. But would this exemption from pain or *positive* punishment for his folly, compensate for the terrible *negative* punishment of blindness? Would it balance the mournful deprivation, which shuts him out from all the glory and beauty of God's universe; from the magnificence of the arched sky, the solemn splendor of the sea, and the living loveliness of the green earth? Would it be an equivalent for the joy he was used to know when looking into the faces of those he loved? when watching the expression of fond affection which lighted up the eye, or beamed from the radiant countenance, of those in whom his heart and life are bound up?

So one might, by continued trial of horrible sounds, destroy the functions of the ear, and at last come to suffer nothing from any combination of noises, however terrific. But would this impunity be worth the price paid for it? He might foolishly exult in his escape from all the disagreeableness of discords, and from the shock of terrible noises; but he has lost also all the pleasure derived from agreeable sounds, all the delights of music, all the ravishing harmonies of nature. The sweet concerts of the woods; the song of the rivulet; the murmur of the zephyr among

Digitized by Google

the leaves; the roll of the thunder; the deep, glorious bass of the sea, when it rouses to the call of the winds; the rich chords of the trembling harp; the mighty rush of the full organ; and first of all, and last of all, the delicious, bewildering, divine melodies of the human voice—Oh, is it nothing to lose all these? And who but a madman, for the sake of escaping the pains of discordant sounds, would let go God's great gift of hearing, through which all these enter to thrill the soul with joy?

But these illustrations of the loss and desolation that would follow as the judgement and punishment of the "seared conscience," need not be confined to the physical world. Let us step out of this into the moral world, and take a single example from this—the *Drunkard.* Look at him in the past, ere he had yielded to the tempter, or fallen from his first estate into the deep places of hell. Temperance and industry laid their blessings at his feet. Virtue, contentment, and domestic peace came and dwelt with him. Confidence, honor and respect waited on him wherever he went. How great the measure of his enjoyment. How perpetual the calm blessedness that distilled upon his heart, like the dew or the small rain upon the tender grass. There was no evil that he feared; there was no joy that did not come to him at his bidding. So was it with him in the better time; and all his happiness was doubly happy because shared with the dear objects of his affection.

But gradually a change crept over him, and he wandered from these pleasant paths. Step by step he lost all love of goodness, of home, of wife and children. And now there is no throb of tenderness in his heart for those who were once so dear. All regard and affection are utterly extinguished; and he treats them with savage cruelty even, while he welters in the reeking depths of drunkenness and depravity.

Now let it be granted that all this gives him no pain; that his sin and degradation, his cruelty toward those whom he is bound to protect and cherish, cause him no remorse whatever—still how mournful and dreadful the contrast between his present and past condition! How incalculable the loss of happiness he has experienced in flinging from him the virtue, honor, contentment, and domestic peace which greeted him in his better days. To

Digitized by Google

say nothing of the loss of physical comforts, of health and a well-ordered and well-provided house; yet of what an immense treasure has he robbed himself. The respect of his fellows; the confiding affections of his wife and children; the holy and beautiful associations that clustered about his home—the look of love, the glad welcome, the sweet face of his companion, and the merry chirping of his little ones, and the calm delights of the fireside; the consciousness of being at peace with God, with the world and himself — what a treasure-house of blessedness was there here, now laid waste by his great sin. Never again will the fire be kindled on the cold hearthstone. Never more will his household gods return to their places; nor the divine hymn of the past be lifted again. Those dear words, *Home*, *Wife*, *Mother*, *Child*, have no meaning for him now; they will never more thrill his soul with joy, or make music in the sanctuary of his heart. That heart, and its affections, its hopes and its joys, are dead. The well-springs whose gushing waters refreshed and gladdened the farthest recesses of his being, are dried up by his sin; and the very earth about them is parched and cracked with the volcanic heat!

And is there no punishment in this fearful ruin of the heart's paradise? Is it nothing that such a frightful solitude has come into the place of so much beauty and blessedness, into the garden once so full of flowers and fruits? Ah yes; we feel that this very barrenness of soul, this blasting of the moral nature and affections, this utter wreck of joy and hope, is in itself the judgement of judgements, more terrible than any pang which conscience has the power to inflict.

I might go on adding illustration to illustration, and proof to proof; but enough has been presented to show that, admitting the common view of the "seared conscience" to be correct, admitting that it is possible to destroy the moral sense and feeling, and crush the conscience into palsy and death—even then the sinner is far from escaping the just judgement of God, or the righteous retribution of his wrong. If conscience gives no pain, it brings no joy. If it inflicts no punishment, it bestows no reward. If it has no shudderings in contact with evil, it experiences no throb of pleasure in the presence of good.

Digitized by Google

If the fires of hell have gone out, so has the light of heaven. No kind word, no generous action, no self-sacrifice of others or its own, ever kindles one emotion of pleasure. Nothing true, or beautiful, or noble, ever imparts any warmth; ever sheds into his soul one gleam of joy, or begets one heavenward aspiration. But in the place of these, in the place of the greenness and freshness, the glory and the bliss of spiritual life, there is only this wide, silent, unbroken solitude of moral death—this wild and dreary waste of being, stretching out on all sides to the horizon; without an oasis in it, without one green thing to relieve the eye, or gladden the heart of the weary and perishing wanderer. This, we repeat, would be the awful price paid for a dead conscience! At such cost who would purchase it?

T. B. T.

Article XIV.

The Rights of the South.

It is not without some degree both of diffidence and reluctance, that I approach the subject of this article. It is well known to my friends, in general, that I have heretofore cautiously abstained from writing or publicly speaking on the subject of slavery and anti-slavery, on the conflicting views and interests of the North and South, and on the respective rights of the slave-holding and non slave-holding States. This I have done, until very recently, from a conviction that the proper time had not yet come for a general and earnest agitation, or thorough discussion, of the subject. Indeed, I have thought, till recently, that its discussion could not only do no good, but that it tended positively to mischief; that while the North was fretting itself for nothing, the South was becoming more irritated, and more desperate in its attachment to the "peculiar institution;" that, if "let alone," our Southern fellow-citizens would ultimately see and feel the evil of the institution, and so throw off the

Digitized by Google

incubus, and return to the course of policy which their fathers, of Revolutionary memory, evidently contemplated. But the new phases and aspects in the South and Southwest, the new positions assumed, the new claims set up, and new encroachments attempted to be made, by the slave power, on the domains of freedom, seem to indicate that, however justifiable and necessary abstinence from discussion may have been heretofore, the time for silence has now gone by. The crisis is at hand. Discussion, full and free discussion, is now in order, and must come. There is no such thing as avoiding it, even if we would. It is alike necessary now both for the North and the South. Let both them come up to the work, and have a fair investigation of the whole subject in all its bearings and interests.

But while we think the time has fully come for open discussion, we would have that discussion free from all uncharitableness, severity and personality. We would have it frank but liberal and fraternal. None other can subserve the cause of truth and right. Certainly none other on our part can benefit the South. I would have it distinctly understood that, in what I may say on the subject, I have no prejudices to gratify, no self-interest to serve, no party to please. And it is not without regret that I shall feel myself obliged to utter some truths that may possibly give pain to some of our Southern brethren. For we are truly brethren, and bound to treat each other as such. Towards the South, and our brethren of the South, I feel nothing but good will. I have visited them in their own hospitable dwellings, sat by their firesides, shared their kindnesses, talked with and felt for them as a brother. And I well know there are as kind and generous hearts among them as I have ever met with on earth. It is for this very reason that, though to some of them it may be unwelcome, I would speak to them "the truth in love.

In this article I do not design to discuss, to any extent, the merits or demerits, the right or the wrong, of slavery in itself. This subject has been, and is, so generally discussed all over the Northern parts of the Union, and over all the world, except some parts of the slave-holding States, that it were a supererogatory work for me to undertake it here. My design is to examine more particularly

Digitized by Google

what are termed, by Southern men, the peculiar Rights of the South, in relation to those of the North, and the alleged encroachments upon those rights of the South, by the people or States of the North.

We hear much said by Southern members of Congress, Southern papers, caucuses, conventions, governors, and State legislatures, about the rights of the South, and the invasion of those rights by the North; as if the North were oppressing her Southern brethren, exacting from them concessions of one prerogative after another, till finally the South has been virtually despoiled of her rights, her equality with the North, her greatness, her glory, and her power. One would think, to hear the complaints on this subject, that the "compromises of the constitution," on which much has lately been said by the South, had been wholly disregarded and trampled on by the North. In the discussions in Congress of the Wilmot Proviso, (or of the principle of the ordinance of 1787, embodied therein, of excluding slavery from territories now free,) Southern members have expressed themselves in very strong, and sometimes very violent and offensive language. Mr. Calhoun says, "I am a Southern man, and a slave-holder. I say for one I would rather meet any extremity upon earth than give up one inch of our *equality*." Mr. Butler, of South Carolina, "would before God, warn gentlemen, if the South was to be regarded and treated with *inequality*, they would tear up the instrument (the Constitution) to which they had subscribed in good faith." Mr. Thompson of Mississippi said, "the passage of the amendment, (the Wilmot Proviso,) would be the dissolution of the Union." A convention in South Carolina, "resolved that a submission to the proposed exclusion from an equality of benefits in the territories of the United States, beyond what is already yielded by the Missouri compromise, would be unwise, dangerous, dishonorable, and debasing." A convention in Alabama, condemned the Proviso as "in derogation of Southern equality and tending directly to subvert the Union." A similar convention in Georgia declared that the Proviso, if enacted, would "have no binding force." And a meeting in Richmond, Va., resolved "that we will by all peaceable means, and this failing, by arms if necessary, sustain such of our fellow-citizens as may

Digitized by Google

elect to settle within any such territory hereafter acquired, in the maintenance of their right thus to settle and take their slaves with them." The Governor of Virginia says, "the South never can consent to be confined to prescribed limits," (as to territory in which to extend slavery). "She wants and must have space." The Governor of Mississippi says, "we will not submit to be told that slave territory is not to be acquired on this or on the other side of that line." (36° 30′ North, and the Rio Grande, West.) And when, recently, a petition from the inhabitants of New Mexico, couched in the most respectful terms, was presented to Congress, praying for an organized government excluding slavery therefrom in accordance with their late Mexican and present laws, Mr. Calhoun, a member of that grave and honorable body, the Senate of the United States, denounced their petition as of an insolent character, coming, as he said, "from the people of a conquered territory, the property alike of every portion of the United States." And for this reason, he said, he pronounced it disrespectful and insolent "because it aimed to deprive the South of their rights."

We might cite much more language similar to the foregoing, from influential Southern speakers and writers, going to show that they consider the North as aggressors, as having violated or disregarded the compromises of the Constitution, and as constantly aiming to trample on the rights of the South. But let us look this subject fairly in the face, and endeavor to ascertain what are the compromises of the Constitution; on which side, if either, concessions have been made; what are really and relatively the rights of the North and the South; and how far, if at all, either section of the Union has monopolized prerogatives not properly belonging to it, or invaded the rights of the other. From the tone of the South one would naturally be led to suppose that the Constitution not only guarantied the perpetuity of slavery in the slave-holding States, but pledged the North to aid in preserving it intact in the District of Columbia, (over which Congress has exclusive jurisdiction,) and to authorize to an unlimited extent the slave trade, (which Maryland had abolished before ceding her part of the District to the Union;) and still farther, to aid in extending slavery over vast regions of free

Digitized by Google

territory for the especial accommodation and interest of a few slave-holders of the South! But what are the facts in relation to these things?

I. What are the real compromises of the Constitution? A compromise between two parties is generally supposed to embrace concessions on both sides, a yielding up of something by each party in the contract. But what concessions did the South make to the North in the adoption of the Federal Constitution? None whatever. She conceded nothing. All the concessions that were made, were made by the North; and these the South is pleased to call "*mutual* compromises." But what were they? Briefly these. 1. Three fifths of all persons not free shall be added to the number of free persons in determining the basis both of representation and taxation. 2. Persons held to service or labor in one State, escaping to another, &c. shall be delivered up on claim of the party to whom such service or labor may be due. 3. "The migration or importation of such persons as any of the States, *now existing*, shall think proper to admit, shall not be prohibited by Congress prior to 1808." There is no other part of the Constitution supposed to allude directly or indirectly to the "peculiar institution." Well, have not these three articles of the Constitution, or concessions of the North to the South, been faithfully adhered to by the former? They have most strictly. However humiliating and trying to the spirit of freedom and equality at the North, no State has sought to resist or counteract them.[1] The third item above specified ceased to be of any force in 1808, more than forty years ago. And though it was a concession from the North, the very language used in it implies the right of Congress to prevent by prohibitory enactments

[1] We are aware that the South complains of the bad faith of the North in relation to the second item specified, (the delivering up of fugitives from service.) But as a general thing, until very recently, we think the North has too tamely submitted to the demands of Southerners, seeking and claiming colored persons as their slaves, who were not really such. The North has often yielded to these claims without proof of their validity; and many a friendless person of color, entitled to freedom, has been violently forced away into life-lasting bondage. The North now generally demands, and ought to demand, full proof that service is really due from the person claimed to the person demanding him, before yielding him up.

Digitized by Google

both the "migration" and "importation," of such persons as are specified, meaning slaves; and, of course, Congress has possessed the constitutional power for more than forty years, to prohibit the inter-state slave trade. But owing to the forbearance of the North, Congress has never exercised that indubitable right. Though Congress has never claimed the power, and no Northern man has ever claimed it for Congress, to legislate on the subject of slavery *within* the several States where it exists, yet it is perfectly obvious that the framers of the Federal Constitution, the Fathers of the Revolution and of the Republic, both those of the North and those of the South, throughout the original thirteen States, generally contemplated the ultimate cessation of slavery in the Union; that they considered it a great evil which required time to get rid of; but, that they looked forward to the time when slavery should be entirely abolished. As an evidence of this, it should be remarked that neither *slaves* nor *slavery* are once mentioned by name in the whole Constitution; indicating that the framers of that instrument were ashamed to use such terms, conscious of their incompatibility with the Declaration of Independence and with the principles of freedom therein asserted. Again; in Mr. Jefferson's first draft of the Declaration of Independence, it was made a serious charge against England, and one ground of our separation from her, that she had forced slaves and slavery upon us against our will, and persisted in the practice against our remonstrances. So early as October 18, 1774, as appears from the first volume of the Journals of Congress, the Continental Congress adopted a plan of association, looking to the ultimate extinction of slavery; in one article of which compact is found the following language; "We will neither import, nor purchase any slaves imported, after the first day of December next; after which time we will wholly discontinue the slave trade, and will neither be concerned in it ourselves, nor will we hire our vessels, nor sell our commodities or manufactures, to those who are concerned in it." This plan of association was signed by George Washington, by Peyton Randolph, (President of Congress) by the Lees, the Henrys, the Pendletons, the Randolphs, the Rutledges, and nearly all the prominent and influential members of the South as well as of

Digitized by Google

the North; for it should be recollected that slavery then existed in several of the Northern States. In harmony with the plan, thus adopted by the Continental Congress, Thomas Jefferson introduced into the Federal Congress, March 1, 1784, (the very day Virginia ceded to Congress her right and title to the Northwestern territory,) a plan for the government of said territory, abolishing slavery therein, (which had already been established there,) and, after 1800, forever prohibiting its existence in all the region Northwest of the Ohio river, embracing what are now the States of Ohio, Michigan, Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin, &c. Though there was a large majority in Congress for adopting the plan reported by Mr. Jefferson, (16 against 7,) yet as nine States were required to vote for it to make it a law, and as six only voted for it, three against it, one was divided and one lost, having but one delegate present, it failed then of beoming a law. But three years afterwards, it was carried in Congress without a dissenting voice; and thus abolished and forever excluded slavery from all that fine region of country.

That the Constitution of the United States never contemplated the addition of any more slave States to the Union, after the first federation of the old thirteen States, is, I think, perfectly obvious, not only from the foregoing facts and the openly avowed sentiments of the revolutionary and leading men of the nation, but from the fact that the ordinance of 1787, and the Constitution of the United States, were formed at the same time, in the same city, by two bodies constituted in part of the same members, and mutually co-operating to fix and determine the future policy of the country. But from this time on, new members of different views and feelings, multiplied in Congress; new objects of gain and ambition were presented; North Carolina, South Carolina and Georgia, ceded territory to the Union, with conditions in their deeds of cession against the application of the Jeffersonian ordinance; and by degrees the nation seemed to forget, and to recede from, the noble stand it had so lately occupied with regard to slavery. Additional territory was purchased of France and Spain, in which slavery existed, and where it was allowed to remain undisturbed. Tennessee, Louisiana, Mississippi and Alabama, successively applied to Con-

Digitized by Google

gress, and were admitted as slave States. A strong opposition was manifested against the admission of Missouri, as such, but she was finally admitted by a compromise, as it was called, though the concession, as usual, was wholly on the part of the North. Arkansas and Florida came in without any show of opposition. The slave power, thus strengthened, became more bold and grasping; and, reaching out its hand toward Texas, demanded that that large tract, sufficient for from five to ten States, should be wrested from the sister Republic of Mexico, and annexed to our Union as a slave State. What did the North do, at this juncture? Northern men were so accommodating to the demands of the South, that she obtained all she demanded; the deed was done, and thus the eighth slave State was added to the Union, with materials for almost indefinite multiplication. Then followed, as the foreseen and predicted fruits of this annexation, the recent war with Mexico, and the wresting from her of a large extent of territory to be added to the Union. With this, came the "cool" demand of the South, that though this territory is now free, (slavery having years ago been abolished therein by Mexico,) it shall become *slave* territory, out of which to manufacture many more slave States hereafter; making a grand outlet, and unlimited and highly profitable mart, for the surplus slaves of the older slave-holding and slave-breeding States.

Now, let candid men reflect on the foregoing historical facts, on their causes, their obvious bearings, their experienced and probable results; and then say, which section of the Union has most reason to complain; which most has suffered wrong by the encroachments of the other; whose rights and prerogatives, if any, have been trampled upon; which has most patiently borne insult and wrong; which has most nearly carried out, or sought to carry out, the great principles of our forefathers, of the original Continental Congress, of the Declaration of Independence, and of the framers of our Constitution? Nobody can be at a loss to determine these questions. And yet, from whom do we hear the most complaints of suffering wrong, of being deprived of their rights, the most threats of dissolving the Union if they cannot have their own way in all things? Let the candid in all sections of the Union an-

Digitized by Google

swer. While the South talks as if the Constitution, by its "compromises" guaranties perpetual slavery, the fact is, it does no such thing—it does not so much as *name* slavery, nor recognize any human beings as *property*, *chattels* or *things*, nor speak of them in any other terms than as "persons." When the South therefore *speaks* of *slaves*, of having *property* in human beings, calling them *chattels* and *things*, it does so entirely without the warrant or sanction of the Constitution. When will the people of this Union understand their own Constitution?

II. Let us next inquire, whether the North has ever encroached upon the rights or legitimate prerogatives of the South in regard to her equal and just share of the influence, the honors, or emoluments of office or station, either in the legislative, judicial, or executive departments of our government? Has the North engrossed more than her share of these, or denied to the South her just proportion? The following are the facts. After the last census of the Union was taken, the odd ratio of 70,680 was, through the management of Southern men, adopted as the numerical basis of representation in Congress; and by it four large free States, New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio and Massachusetts, lost each a representative, which they would have retained had the ratio been fixed at the round number, 70,000, while each of the slave States had the same number they would have been entitled to at the ratio of 70,000. At that time the number of slaves in the United States was 2,487,113. Three-fifths of that number is 1,492,266; which, divided by 70,680, gives 21 representatives,—just the number of Southern supernumeraries in Congress over and above the representatives of the free population of Southern States. In the Presidential election of 1840, there were 294 electors chosen; of these, 168 were from the free, and 126 from the slave States. The popular vote in the free States was 1,726,737, or one elector to 10,278 votes. The popular vote in the slave States, was 682,583, or one elector to 5,935 votes. New York gave 443,331 votes, and had 42 electors; Virginia, Maryland and North Carolina gave 229,569 votes, and had 48 electors. Ohio gave 272,939 votes, and had 21 electors; while Georgia, Delaware, Kentucky, Alabama, Louisiana, and Arkansas, gave 265,941 votes and had 44 electors.

Digitized by Google

In 1840, the population of Ohio was 1,519,467. The eight *new* slave-holding States, admitted since the formation of the Union, had then a free population exceeding by less than one fourth that of the single free State of Ohio, and yet these States have eight times as many votes as Ohio in the Senate of the United States; and have, in the House of Representatives, seven for their slaves; and consequently they cast 50 votes for President and Vice-President, while Ohio casts but 23!

Do these things look as if the South has been deprived of her equal rights in regard to members of Congress and electors of President? But notwithstanding this disparity in favor of the South, or the slave-holding interest, the North, nevertheless, has, owing to her larger population, given a majority of votes in the electoral college. But how have the votes of the North and the South been given? and what have been the results? During twenty years, and six Presidential elections, the South cast 608 electoral votes; and only 41 of them were for Northern candidates. Of the 15 Presidential terms, 12 have been filled by slave-holders; and only three were filled by Northern men. Again: no Northern man has ever been allowed to serve more than a single term; and all Southern men, elected as Presidents, except Mr. Polk, have served a second term. From the adoption of the Constitution to June 1842, there were 76 elections of President of the Senate, *pro tem.* Of these the slave States had 60, and the free States 16. While the Senate was equally divided between the slave-holding and the non slave-holding States, the former would almost always contrive to secure the presiding officer. For 30 years previous to 1842, no Northern man had held the office. Of the 15 who had filled the office of Secretary of State up to 1845, the slave States had 10; and the free States 5. We think it will not be disputed that the South has generally filled a majority of the posts of honor, influence, profit and emolument in the civil, judicial, diplomatic, military and naval departments; and that while the free States have usually furnished the men, soldiers and sailors, for the army and navy, the slave States have furnished the principal part of the officers for both. But while these are undeniable facts, and while this partiality to men of the South, in the distribution of

Digitized by Google

these offices of profit, honor and influence, must be admitted by all, it cannot be urged, in justification of such a course, that the South furnished abler or better educated men, or that education and intelligence were more generally diffused at the South, than at the North. The reverse of this is the fact. Hon. H. A. Wise, Member of Congress from Virginia, stated that there was not a single newspaper establishment in his district. By the last census it appears that the persons who could not read and write in Connecticut, was 1 to every 568; and in Virginia, 1 to every 12½. Of "scholars at public charge," there were, in the free States, 432,173; and in the slave States, only 35,580. Ohio had 51,812; Kentucky only 429. While these statistics show the great contrast in education in favor of the North, they also show an almost equal contrast in the distribution of office in favor of the South. And from what does the latter proceed, but from the remissness or indifference of the North to the emoluments of office and the principles of freedom, and the over vigilance and activity of the South in favor of her own peculiar institution? If the North is censurable at all, it seems to me it is for her coldness and indifference to her rights and to the cause of freedom, rather than for any encroachments upon the rights of the South.

III. I now propose to show that the South, or leading political men of the South, not content with their prescriptive prerogatives, and their more than equal share with the North of votes, office, station and power, assume arrogant airs towards the North, and lay claim to rights to which they have no title, and to concede which would be alike destructive of freedom and subversive of equality.

Of the legal voters in the United States, the slave-holders are about *one to twenty.* And with this mighty disparity in numbers, look at her inverse proportion of power and influence in our Federal Union, as exhibited in the preceding section! Look at the airs she assumes, the pretensions she sets up, and the claims she prefers. She obviously aims, not only to perpetuate slavery where it exists, but to extend it where it does not exist; to overawe the North, and coerce it into subserviency to her own schemes of oppression and selfishness; and what she cannot do by persuasion and bargaining, she seems determin-

Digitized by Google

ed to accomplish by threatening secession from the Union. That such has long been her object (i. e. the object of her leading political men,) is sufficientiy clear to every attentive observer. This was the avowed design of citizens of the Southern States in going to Texas and raising a revolt in that province against Mexico. This was the avowed object in annexing Texas to the United States. This was the main object in the late Mexican war; and this was the principal reason why so large a territory was purchased from Mexico in the late treaty with that power; it was the only reason why the American Commissioners, in negotiating terms of peace with Mexico, refused to listen to any terms proposed by the latter by which slavery should be prohibited in the provinces acquired.

If proof be wanting of these facts, it is at hand. "As far back as 1829, the annexation of Texas was agitated in the Southern and Western States; and it was urged on the ground of the strength and extension it would give the slave-holding interest. In a series of essays ascribed to a gentleman now a Senator in Congress, it was maintained that five or six slave-holding States would by this measure be added to the Union; and he even intimated that as many as nine States as large as Kentucky might be formed within the limits of Texas. In Virginia, about the same time, calculations were made as to the increased value which would thus be given to slaves, and it was even said that this acquisition would raise the price fifty per cent. . . . . The great argument for annexing Texas, is, that it will strengthen 'the peculiar institutions' of the South, and open a new and vast field for slavery."[2] "The project of dismembering a neighboring Republic that slave-holders and slaves might overspread a region which had been consecrated to a free population, was discussed in newspapers as coolly as if it were a matter of obvious right and unquestionable humanity. . . The old States now adhere to slavery, not on account of the wealth it extracts from the soil, but because it furnishes men and women to be sold in newly settled and more Southern districts. It is by slave-breeding and slave-sel-

[2] See Dr. Channing's Letter to Henry Clay on the Annexation of Texas, August 1837.

Digitized by Google

ling that these States subsist. Take away from them a foreign market, and slavery would die. Of consequence, by opening a new market it is prolonged and invigorated."[3] In proof that it was both the object and expectation of the South to extend slavery by the war with Mexico, see the following avowals:—The Charleston, (S. C.) Patriot said, "We trust that our Southern representatives will remember that this is a *Southern war.*" The Charleston Courier said, "Every battle fought in Mexico, and every dollar spent there, but insures the acquisition of territory which must widen the field of Southern enterprise and power for the future; and the final result will be to adjust the whole balance of power in the confederacy so as to give *us the control over the operations of the government in all time to come.*" The (Georgia) Federal Union said, "It is true this is a war in which the South is more immediately interested. . . . . Let the South now be true to herself, and the days of her vassalage are gone forever." The Mobile Herald said, "The natural tendency of the slaves, under our humane policy, is to increase. The effect follows, that if we have no *outlet* for them, no soil to put them on, they will be huddled within the extreme Southern limits of the Union. *These evils may be avoided by taking new territory in the direction of Mexico. The profitable existence of slavery is by no means incompatible with a more temperate region, but it is incompatible with a very dense population.* We must have *plenty of soil* to make it profitable."

In pursuance of the object thus openly avowed by the South, in waging and carrying on the war with Mexico, and the attainment of territory there, leading Southern men now claim the right of extending slavery into the newly acquired territory, and deny that Congress has the right to prohibit its introduction there. We know that in a late "Address of Southern delegates in Congress to their constituents," drawn up by Mr. Calhoun of S. C., it is denied that they "ask for the extension of slavery." They say, "What then we do insist on, is, not to extend slavery, but that we shall not be prohibited from immigrating, with our

[3] Dr. Channing's Letter to Henry Clay, &c.

Digitized by Google

property, into the territories of the United States, because we are slave-holders; or in other words, that we shall not, on that account, be disfranchised of a privilege possessed by all others, citizens and foreigners, without discrimination as to character, profession or color. All, whether savage, barbarian, or civilized, may freely enter and remain; we only being excluded." Now, we wish to know what Mr. Calhoun means by the privilege of "emigrating with our property into the territories of the United States," &c. Does he not mean that they shall have the right to take slaves to the newly acquired territories, (where slavery does not now exist) and there hold them and use them *as slaves*, and their children as slaves after them forever? Most clearly he means this. For in no other sense than in this, are any Southerners, or slave-holders, debarred or sought to be debarred, "from emigrating with their property" to the new territories. They have, in common with all others, the right to take all the property they have—money, goods, furniture, live stock—anything, everything, including slaves if they have the right of property in them. But then, when they get there, slaves are no longer *slaves*, *things*, or *chattels*, but persons, human beings, and therefore free. It is not true, then, that slave-holders are "prohibited from emigrating with their property" to the new territories; it is only true that they are prohibited from holding human beings, who are guilty of no crime, in life-lasting bondage, in free territory. They are just as free to "emigrate with their property" to the newly acquired territories, as they are to emigrate to New York, Massachusetts, or any of the free States. And hundreds of slave-holders have emigrated to free States and free territory, as a matter of choice, because they would no longer remain in a slave State. But if the complaint, in Mr. Calhoun's address to Southerners, be founded on the fact that they are not allowed to hold human beings in bondage in the free territories of the United States, then it is *not* true, as pretended in this address, that the South does "not ask for the extension of slavery." They do ask for it, and demand it, either by positive enactment in its favor, or by connivance at its introduction and existence in the newly acquired territories. For farther proof that such is the demand of the South, see the extract from the Resolutions of a

Digitized by Google

meeting in Richmond, before quoted in this article, in which it is threatened to use force of arms, if necessary, to secure that right.

It seems to us that the Southern States might just as well enact a law allowing *polygamy*, and permitting each planter to have a dozen wives; and then complain of illiberal treatment, and of being deprived of their just and equal rights, because they are not allowed to take each man his dozen wives to New York, Santa Fe, or San Francisco, and live with them all, and have his polygamy legalized in those several places, whether in State or territory. This would be no more unreasonable, than to complain of being wronged and unjustly deprived of their *rights*, because they are not allowed to extend the institution of slavery over a region where freedom is established. Such a plea sounds rather strange, in this middle of the nineteenth century, when all christendom, nay the whole civilized world, is in arms for freedom, and slavery receives the universal condemnation of our race, as a relic of barbarism, whose days are numbered.

Another demand of the South is, the right to make Washington, the seat of our national government, the great mart, a *national* mart, for slaves—the place to buy and sell to an unlimited extent, for the special benefit of all the slave-holders and slave-dealers in the Union, and the denial to Congress of the right to interfere with the traffic. Although many of the slave-holding States, (and Maryland which ceded most of the District of Columbia to the Union, included among them,) have passed laws prohibiting the importation of slaves into their boundaries for sale; and though the inhabitants of the District themselves have petitioned Congress to abolish the slave trade in the District;[4] and though strong Southern men many years

[4] The following memorial signed by over a thousand citizens of the District, among whom were the present District Judge (Cranch), Mayor Van Ness, and many other eminent citizens, was presented to Congress, in 1828, praying for the abolition of this traffic in slaves:

"We the undersigned, citizens of the District of Columbia, beg leave to call the attention of your honorable body to an evil of appalling magnitude, which greatly impairs the prosperity and happiness of this District, and *casts the reproach of inconsistency upon the free institutions established among us.*

"While the laws of the United States denounce the Foreign Slave Trade as Piracy, and punish with death those who are found engaged

Digitized by Google

ago denounced it in severe terms and demanded its abolition,[5]—it is still continued; and a late proposition in Congress to abolish it, was met, on the threshold, by Southern men, with threats of violence or dissolution of the Union. And still, this proposition asks only that Congress shall do, in the District of Columbia, (where it has full and exclusive jurisdiction,) the very thing that Mississippi, Missouri, Arkansas, Kentucky, Delaware, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Tennessee, Louisiana, Virginia, and Maryland, have successively done within and for themselves.[6] Witness the following resolution lately introduced into the Virginia House of Delegates by Mr. Scott, it being one of a long set, of similar import, and intended as a substitute for a still more ultra and severe set, previously introduced by Mr. Floyd; "Resolved, that we consider any interference by Congress, within the District of Columbia, without the consent of its inhabitants, with the rights of the slave-holder, among which is the right to buy and sell, at variance with the fundamental principles of free governments, and a direct attack upon the institutions of the Southern States; the first act of meditated war upon the rights secured by the Constitution, which ought to

in its perpetration, there exists in this District, the seat of the National Government, a domestic Slave Trade *scarcely less disgraceful in its character and even more demoralizing in its tendency.*

"For this is not, like the former, carried on against a barbarous nation: Its victims are reared up among the people of this country, educated in the precepts of the same religion, and imbued with similar domestic attachments.

"These people are, without their consent, torn from their homes; husband and wife frequently separated and sold into distant parts; children are taken from their parents, without regard to the ties of nature, and the most endearing bonds of affection are broken forever.

"Nor is this traffic confined to those who are legally slaves for life. Some who are entitled to freedom, and many who have a limited time to serve, are sold into unconditional slavery; and, owing to the defectiveness of our laws, they are generally carried out of our District before the necessary steps can be taken for their release."

[5] In 1816, John Randolph, an extensive and determined slave-holder in Virginia, introduced into Congress the following spicy resolution: "*Resolved*, That a Commitee be appointed to inquire into the existence of *an inhuman and illegal traffic in slaves*, carried on in and through the District of Columbia, and to report whether any and what measures are necessary for putting a stop to the same."

[6] See Speech of Mr. Fine in the United States Senate, Jan. 4, 1849.

Digitized by Google

be met at the threshold and resisted at every hazard." In perfect keeping with this resolution is the language of Hon. Mr. Yulee, a Southern Senator in Congress, Jan. 22, 1849, upon the resolutions passed by the legislature of New York, instructing her members in Congress to vote for securing the rights of the United States in the newly acquired territory against the unfounded claims of Texas and against the encroachments of slavery. He says, "I value the Union; but I value it only to that degree in which it is instrumental in securing the liberties of the people, and in carrying out the great principles of equality of the Constitution." In reading the last two quotations, we must remember that, in the peculiar dialect of their authors, *freedom*, *liberty*, mean slavery, and equality, the privilege of domineering.

Again, the South demands the extension of slavery into, and loudly demurs against its exclusion from, the newly acquired territory, on the ground that the latter is "the property alike of every portion of the United States—purchased by the common blood and common treasure of the whole Union." The fact is, it was by the influence of the South, that Texas was annexed and war waged with Mexico; and is it not rather "cool" in her, after appropriating the immense region of Texas to the strengthening of her slave interests, to demand that the war and all its fruits shall be consecrated to the extension of slavery, against the interests of the North, and against the moral sentiment of universal humanity? What right has the South to demand this? Judge it on mere statistics. Has she a larger population than the North? Not so large. If numbers are to govern, this demand cannot be acceded to. Did the South furnish more than her quota of men and money for the acquisition of the new territory? No; it appears by a statement made out from official documents,[7] that, of the men who entered the army from Jan. 1, 1846, to June 30, 1848, there were 23,569 from the free States, and only 11,861 from the slave States—nearly twice as many from the free as from the slave States. As to the expenses of the war, into which the South plunged us against the wishes of a majority of the North, the latter has always

[7] See New York Tribune of Jan. 19, ult.

Digitized by Google

furnished her full share, besides suffering largely in all money revulsions, from the bankruptcy of the South. And as to Southern men being excluded from the newly acquired territory, or their just share in it, or the privilege of emigrating to it, we have seen that there is no just cause for any such complaint. In fact, the extension of slavery would far more effectually exclude the inhabitants of the free States from the new territory, than would its prohibition the inhabitants of the slave States. For while it remains free territory, the present slave-holder in the States can sell his slaves, remove there, and hire free labor at less expense than it would cost him to own slaves, and get it done by them; so that he is really benefited by its prohibition. But the inhabitants of the free States cannot, in conscience, buy and own slaves, though slavery were legalized in the now free territory; nor can they consistently, nor will they, go there and labor in competition with slave labor, and under the contempt and reproach heaped on free white laborers by the slave-holder. Thus, from every point of view in which we can look upon the subject, it is obvious that the South assumes attitudes towards the North that are entirely unwarrantable, and lays claims to rights to which she has no title. To concede those claims, would be alike destructive of freedom and subversive of equality, besides disappointing the high expectations and philanthropic aims of the founders of our Republic.

There is one other point connected with this subject, to which, before closing this article, I desire to call public attention, both at the North and the South, to which apparently little attention has been paid, and to which, it seems to me, much should be given. It is this; that while the slave States send to Congress twenty-one representatives *more* than their free population entitle them to, and these twenty-one supernumeraries are sent professedly and really on the *basis of the slave population*, they, instead of *representing the wishes and interests of the slaves*, whose numbers contribute to send them, really misrepresent their wishes and interests, legislate *against* them, and *for* the interests of the oppressors of the slaves. These representatives, and all other Southern members of Congress, stand up in their places professedly to represent the South, the

Digitized by Google

whole South, with all its population and all its interests. But do they really and truly represent the whole population of the South with all their interests? Very far from it. They entirely misrepresent the wishes and interests of the masses, the large majority of the population of the South—we venture to say both of the whites and blacks. From personal observation and free conversations with intelligent men and slave-holders, while in Virginia, I became perfectly satisfied that at least four-fifths of the white population (to say nothing of slaves and free negroes,) of that State, are opposed to slavery, regarding it as a great evil entailed upon them by their ancestors. They would gladly adopt any practicable and safe method of getting rid of the evil. But then the remaining fifth hold the political power of the State, and control both the legislature and the press. For any editor, or member of the legislature, to utter aught unfavorable to the "patriarchal institution," is certain to incur political ostracism. But how, it will be asked, does one fifth of the population control the other four fifths? I answer, that while neither slaves, free blacks, nor white men destitute of property, are allowed to vote at their elections, and are generally without influence, the rich planters do the voting for them all. They are allowed to vote in as many counties as they own freehold estates in. And hence, by buying small freeholds in a number of different counties, and riding fleet horses on the day of election, they will often manage to poll from three to six votes each. And thus, from generation to generation, is the wrong of slavery and oppression perpetuated by the few against the interests and wishes of the many.

With these facts, "known and read of all men" who have eyes to see and ears to hear, are not the assumptions of the South—or of these few leading men of the South—most astonishing and unaccountable. When these men get up in their places in Congress, and talk about the rights of the South, what do they mean by the *South?* The whole community of the South, the masses of population in the Southern States? Nothing like it. They mean *themselves*—the few slave-holders—making about one in thirty of all the people of the Southern States. And by the rights of the South, they mean not only the

Digitized by Google

right and the power of perpetuating this inequality, and holding their fellow-men in bondage for life, and their children after them to all generations, but the right of extending the same oppressive laws over what is now free territory, and making the seat of our national government the great mart for supplying, forever hereafter, these few Southern men with slaves. In other words, they demand the means to exhaust and ruin the soil of the new territory, as they have already done with the soil on which they now live. They call themselves the people of the South, while in fact they are but the oppressors of the people of the South. They call themselves the representatives of the people and interests of the South, while in truth they misrepresent the masses of the people, and counteract their true interests. They talk loudly of their rights and of the principles of equality, while they really aim at perpetuating a great moral and physical wrong upon their fellow-men, and confirming and extending the greatest possible inequality. When therefore Northern members of Congress insist on abolishing the slave trade in the District of Columbia, (or even slavery itself,) and prohibiting the extension of slavery into the newly acquired territories of the Union, they do not invade the rights of the South, nor abridge the liberties or equality of the inhabitants of any State, but enlarge and confirm them. They prove themselves the true friends of the South,—that is, of the masses of the population of the South—the true champions of liberty, equality and right. The poor white man is as really degraded and oppressed by the customs of the South, as the slave is by the laws of the South; and he knows and feels it. But he has no remedy, but in forsaking his native State, (for which he seldom possesses the means,) or revolutionizing its laws, in framing which he has no voice.

In conclusion, we repeat that we believe the time has come for free discussion of this subject, both at the North and at the South. The truth and the right can never, in the end, be the losers by discussion. But we would urge, especially upon Northern men, calmness, dignity, liberality, and more particularly union among themselves.

D. S.

Digitized by Google

Article XV.

Mountford's Euthanasy.

Euthanasy; or Happy Talk towards the End of Life. By William Mountford, Author of "Martyria," "Christianity the Deliverance of the Soul and its Life," &c. &c. Boston: Wm. Crosby & H. P. Nichols. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1849.

It is difficult to speak of this work in any other than the language of unmingled praise. Its author is a young English Unitarian clergyman, and is settled, we believe, over a small parish near Birmingham. And certainly no one who has read his "Martyria" will need any commendation of his powers from us, or require any urging to procure and peruse this new production of his pen.

The literary faults of "Euthanasy" are apparent at a glance. In artistic finish it is far inferior to the chaste and polished "Martyria." It is cast in the form of dialogue between a young man who has been severely tried by poverty and sickness, and an uncle to whom he is indebted for a pleasant home. But the structure of the dialogue is very inelegant and clumsy. There is no discrimination of character or temperament in the interlocutors, no discussion or shading in the conversation. The uncle and nephew talk precisely alike, and it is quite painful, if one does not read the book with the resolution to overlook its form and forget that it is conversation, to notice how the soliloquy is wrenched from the mouth of one of the speakers and transferred to the other. The style, moreover, is too diffuse, and occasionally sinks into childishness. The effect of the work would have been greater if it had been compressed into a hundred pages less, and the twenty pages of Tasso's Vision might have been wholly omitted without serious injury to the author, the readers, or the book.

But here hostile criticism must end. For clearness of insight, richness and purity of sentiment, calm piety, sweet pathos, fresh, chaste, overflowing fancy, controlled and

Digitized by Google

warmed by a religious spirit, variety of thought, and delicacy of expression, "Euthanasy" must rank high as an original work, and take precedence of all the pietistic books we have. It is easy to see that religion is the element in which the author lives, and it is difficult to doubt that his own character is an illustration of the piety which his words paint so charmingly to the mind.

It is great praise to say of "Euthanasy," that, while it is a deeply spiritual, it is a perfectly healthy, book. It does not give the impression that the author has a morbid, or excessively introversive nature. The piety which exhales from every page readily clothes itself in a diction equally free from sentimentalism and cant. There is stamina in it. In almost every paragraph we are arrested by a fine thought, and touched by a pure sentiment, and yet idea and sentiment are so fused together that we cannot tell which lends the greater charm. It is more deeply true of Mr. Mountford, than of any other writer of our time, that his intellect is baptized in, and saturated with, religion. All his knowledge is a vision in God. His mind is penetrated and pervaded with *a sense* of Deity. He recognizes, with that sure instinct which is inseparable from deep insight, the mystery of nature, but it is only such a mystery as the soul imbued with Christian faith can recognize and love. The universe is not to his eyes, as to those of Carlyle, engirt with lurid, cloudy glare, which throws a volcanic light on life—a light just sufficient to relieve and reveal the darkness within which it flickers; the mystery which he feels is not the rush of a "huge, illimitable whirlwind of force which envelopes us here," but the patient, silent energy of continual love, embracing man and nature in serene and mellow light. In all his manifestations, God is still the Father, and his intellect is never awed into a barren, poetic wonder, but raised into calm and reverential trust.

"Euthanasy" clearly shows, too, that its author has reached the culminating point of spiritual culture, so rare and so necessary in our time,—a steady conception of God's omnipresence and constant consciousness of His personality. There are religious men who believe in special providences, and philosophers who prove the all-controlling agency of an active principle in nature; but by

Digitized by Google

an unfortunate divorce, the piety of the first is coarse and repulsive, and the speculations of the last cheerless and cold. Mr. Mountford is a Christian Pantheist, and so believes in a universal Providence, and an intelligent and holy Omnipresence. In his book we see how finely Christianity blends with, and crowns natural religion, and how necessary is the spirit of the gospel to vivify the splendid truths and laws which modern science has disclosed. There are many pages in "Euthanasy" which seem almost to have been written by St. John after reading the results of modern culture; so perfectly do they harmonize the Christian sentiments with the wealth of modern knowledge. It is delightful to read facts, with which the mind has long been familiar, in the new rich dress with which Mr. Mountford enrobes them, to find familiar truths of geography, chemistry, history, and philosophy, and the common customs of society bear fresh and ready testimony to some profound religious law. With spiritual insight as keen at times as that of Emerson, he yet lives in a very different medium from that which surrounds the great transcendentalist. Instead of the bright, wintry midnight, in which Emerson's passionless intellect delights to watch the cold sparkle of the stars, and the silent play of the unknown forces that arrest all motion, and crystalize formless fluids into order and beauty, Mr. Mountford's conception of nature is symbolised by the summer evening, when the warm, hushed air seems filled with a benignant energy, and the rays of the declining planet suggest a soothing mystery, and nature, with almost conscious pleasure, thrills with an overflowing life which reveals itself in constant growth.

Justice to our author requires that we should speak of his sympathy with the true saints of the past, and his chastened, hearty, loving reverence for Jesus, but our limits will not allow us to indulge our wishes now. The style of "Euthanasy" is entirely original, so quaint, simple, and natural, and leaving such a sad, sweet, solemn music in the ear. Take the following passage as an instance. The uncle complains that they are sad experiences when sight and hearing and motion fail. But the nephew replies:—

"Not sad, uncle Stephen, but serious; and not so serious as solemn. Is your eyesight dimmer? Then the world is seen by

Digitized by Google

you in a cathedral light. Is your hearing duller? Then it is just as though you were always where loud voices and footsteps ought not to be heard. Is your temper not as merry as it was once? Then it is more solemn; so that round you the common atmosphere feels like that of the house of the Lord. Yes, for twilight and silence and solemnity, old age makes us like daily dwellers in the house of the Lord; and a mortal sickness does this, sometimes, as well as old age. But it is our own thoughts that have to supply the service, and our own hearts that have to make the music triumphant, or else like a dirge. And the sermon is preached to us by conscience from some text taken out of the book of our remembrance. While to it all, amen has to be said by ourselves; and when it is said gladly, then there is an echo to it in heaven, and joy among the angels." (pp. 3, 4.)

We have marked, too, a fine thought on immortality:—

"So it is; and that is what we have to say of every function of our bodies, and power of our minds, and of the whole world. How our souls will live hereafter is not a greater mystery, than how our bodies do live now. This world is not like a parlor, in which we know all the furniture, and every corner; if it were, we might well shrink from death, and think it a door opening out of the familiarly known into the fearfully unknown. Birth, growth, health, and sickness, labor wearying the body, and sleep refreshing it, food supporting, and poisons hurting it,—of life in every way, we must say that we cannot tell how it is. And yet there are persons that shrink from the future life, and some that do not believe it, because they do not feel in what way it will be; while what the way is of the very life they are in they cannot tell. For they cannot tell how sight gets into the brain through the humors of the eye, nor how movements of the air get through the ear to be thoughts in the soul. They do not like thinking of death, because it opens into mystery; while they themselves live in mystery, and move in it, and have all their being in it. A man fears for his soul in a new world, while he cannot find a bird, or animal, or insect, not one, which its life does not exactly suit. Out of the body his soul will go into the man knows not what state, and so his mind misgives him; while there is not a swallow comes out of its egg-shell into this great world unsuited to its manner of life; and because the swallow wants it, there is an instinct of flight in it at a month old, which is wiser than geography and astronomy and meteorology." (pp. 42, 43.)

Is not the following also a fresh and powerful statement of the fact that all that is true in the past never dies?

Digitized by Google

"There is in us and about us what is the science, the wisdom, the religion, and the worth of all the centuries since Adam. Yes, in my character there are the effects of Paul's journey to Damascus, and of the meeting of King John and the barons at Runnymede. There is in my soul the seriousness of the many conflicts, and famines, and pestilences of early English times. And of my enthusiasm, some of the warmth is from fiery words that my forefathers thrilled to, in the times of the Commonwealth and the Reformation. There is in me what has come of the tenderness with which mothers nursed their children ages ago, and something that may be traced to the resolute talk of Cromwell and his cousin Hampden; and there is that in me which is holy, and which began from a forty days' fast in a wilderness in Judea, now eighteen hundred years since." (pp. 192, 193.)

A fine characteristic instance of Mr. Mountford's thought and style occurs on p. 391:—

"I feel solemnly among the old walls and arches of what was once a church; and shall I feel less reverently beside what was once a saintly man to look at? Mere flesh and bones,—dust returning unto dust,—is it? What, then, are the remains of Fountain Abbey, of Rievaulx Abbey, and at Castleacre? Stones and lime; and with poor workmanship in them compared with the make of a human body. The body of a departed saint is dead; but it is the ruins of what was once a temple of the Holy Ghost. It is a disused temple; in it, loving wishes no longer form and rise to God like incense; the light of reason in it is put out; the book of remembrance in it is shut, and there is no more reading from it; divine service in it is over, and an eternal Amen has been said to it by Fate; and at the soul's going forth from her temple, there was joy, though elsewhere than among men." (pp. 391, 392.)

And we constantly meet passages like the following:—

"There is no one who would not easily believe in a life to come, if this present life were the wonderful thing to him it ought to be." (p. 387.)

"Uncle, when a body becomes dust, there is not a grain of it that does not feel the laws of attraction and gravitation. And so the soul is not to be feared for; for if through God every particle of the body is drawn into use, then here are a thousand and a million instances of the certain way in which the soul must be drawn into life." (p. 395.)

"Disappointments and anxieties are the subtile food on which to feel how quiet death is." (p. 404.)

Digitized by Google

We could wish that "Euthanasy" might find a rapid sale, and be a companion in every family, less on account of the author's needs, than of the poverty of our literature in good books upon practical religion. There is no man, woman, or intelligent child for whom it might not fulfil a blessed ministry. To the preacher it is invaluable as a suggestive and elévating volume for constant perusal; to the afflicted it would bring calm counsel, and new strength; and young and old, prosperous and sad, it would delight and cheer with "Happy Talk" on the greatest themes of human interest and thought. T. S. K.

Article XVI.

Literary Notices.

1. Democracy in France. By Monsieur Guizot, late Prime Minister; author of "The History of Civilization," etc. etc. New York: D. Appleton & Company, 200 Broadway, &c. 1849. 16mo. pp. 82.

The author's name is a sufficient voucher for the profoundness and importance of an essay on such a subject. It would be very difficult to give an idea of so condensed a work in less room than he himself has occupied. His object is, not a history of the late revolution in France, nor a detailed account of the parties in that country, nor a particular examination of the measures adopted by its legislators; but simply a concise philosophical exposition of the tendencies of the revolutionary movement on the one hand, and, on the other, of the elements which constitute French society, and of the principles on which a government must be formed, if it would meet the imperative demands of the case, and restore public order.

The great evil, which he sees lying at the root of all the present evils of France, is the blind, indiscriminating idolatry of Democracy,—the change of the old legal fiction that "the *king* can do no wrong," into the practical faith that "the *people* can do no wrong;" as if human nature, when taken in the mass, were pure, so that, if left uncontrolled, it would work only to good, or would at least cure its own evils spontaneously. But this is fundamentally a misconception of man, not to say that it is a virtual

Digitized by Google

denial of God's authority over him. Man is indeed ambitious of good both for himself and for his fellow creatures; but he is no less imperfect than ambitious. "Amidst his ardent and unceasing struggles to eradicate evil and achieve good, every one of his virtuous inclinations is accompanied by an evil inclination which treads closely on its heels, or strives with it for precedence. The desire for justice, and the desire for vengeance; the spirit of liberty, and the spirit of tyranny; the wish to rise, and the wish to abase what has risen; the ardent love of truth, and the presumptuous temerity of fancied knowledge;—we may fathom all the depths of human nature, we shall find throughout the same mingled yet conflicting qualities,—the same danger from their close and easy approximation." It is to all these instincts that Democracy addresses itself,—to the bad as well as to the good. Hence, too, the powerful charm it has for the popular mind; a charm resulting as much from the sway it promises to the evil inclinations, as to the good. And so long as it is idolized from all these motives indiscriminately,—so long as the evil it cherishes is confounded with the good, or left ineffectually guarded against, there can be nothing but a succession of disorders, instead of government; nothing but a warfare between the different classes, instead of social peace.

M. Guizot does not object to a Republic, if it only conform to the conditions on which alone it can answer the purpose. But whatever be the form of government, it must be a government,—that is, it must govern, must hold the balance, must repress encroachments from below as well as encroachments from above. It must also be a free and constitutional one, such as will recognize the rights and interests of all the different classes into which society is naturally distinguished,—the conservative and the progressive, the poor and the rich. To this end, it must be represented, or constituted, by all these classes. There must be solid ramparts, under the shadow of which various rights and interests can flourish in safety; there must be safeguards interposed between the personal liberty of the citizens, and the bare will either of a single tyrant or of a no less tyrannical majority of numbers. The Democratical elements must be allowed free play, but only within the bounds of order and justice. Such are the conditions on which alone a true government can be founded; and any thing short of this will prove to be but anarchy or despotism,—neither of which can last long.

We find, on looking over the sketch we have attempted of Guizot's work, that our outline is too bold to warrant our continuing it further. We therefore refer our readers to the book itself. Like all his writings, it is to be studied, not hastily despatched.

Digitized by Google

The political argument is but a small part of its value. The principles it brings out are its distinguishing merit. It abounds with suggestions concerning the moral and social nature of man; and these, coming from one of the profoundest observers of the age, who has devoted a life to tracing the actual operations of the human character in all forms of society, have a peculiar claim on our respectful attention. We are struck with the same wide grasp of thought, united with the same good common sense, that distinguishes his History of Civilization; nor are we less impressed with the fact of his immense superiority, in practical philosophy, over the living writers of his country. We see that he looks straight through the French *fanfaronade*, whether in politics, morals, or religion, and that his clear eye reaches the heart of the matter.

It is a question of great interest to the civilized world, What will be the fate of the present revolution in France? So far as the existing form of government is concerned, the whole depends, in our view, on the answer to another question, What is the moral condition of France?—perhaps we should say, of Paris? for Paris has hitherto determined the movement. If the people are really virtuous in their principles and manners, then they can govern themselves, and their present institutions, with such amendments as may be quietly made, will outride the storm in which they arose. But if a corrupt civilization has rotted out from the people the domestic and public virtues, and left them nothing instead except æsthetic culture and a fine taste for pleasure,—if their ardor for "fraternity and equality" is but "rose-pink sentimentalism," overlaying a greedy appetite for indulgence, then they cannot govern themselves, and their Republic will end in despotism, either directly or through the intermediate stage of anarchy. Thus far, we confess, the symptoms are of the most discouraging kind, to one who looks at principles rather than at their *vivats* and "demonstrations to the universe." Compare the manner and spirit in which they have acted, with those in which our own countrymen established a Republic! Or, if this be deemed an unfair challenge, since it does not allow for the peculiarities of Frenchmen, then compare their method with that in which the French themselves ever accomplished any thing real and permanent. On the contrary, mark its striking resemblance to that of their revolution in the last century! But still, whatever may be the proximate result, we are confident that the universal agitation, the upheaving of the old foundations, the shaking asunder of artificial barriers, will eventually be of service to the people of France. It will at last leave them freer and in a more favorable condition than they have hitherto

Digitized by Google

been. Blood may have to be let, one form of government after another may go down in violence, the wildest schemes of the Communists or the Fourierites may gain the ascendancy, and for a while hold society itself dissolved; but even the blind rage of the elements will clear an atmosphere, which, if common fame be true, must be cleared in some way. The old French revolution did much towards the work, though at a terrible expense; and the present revolution will be found at last to have carried on the process,—God grant that it be at a less frightful cost.

2. The History of England from the Accession of James II. By Thomas Babington Macaulay. Vol. II. New York: Harper & Brothers, &c. 1849. 8vo. pp. 617.

A discriminating and just notice of the first volume of this work was given in our No. for January. The high commendations then bestowed are in every respect applicable to the second volume also. Never have we read a history in which the state of affairs and the course of events were laid out in so clear and steady a light, nor in which there was a more intense interest than is awakened by this easy, flowing, but rich narrative. If Macaulay can sustain himself to the end of his task, as he has begun, his work will be the great historical master-piece of the age, and will take rank with the few achievements of the kind which have been transmitted as the choicest productions of all former ages.

We should like to particularize some of the characters that are here drawn, or some of the events that are described, or stories that are related; but we find ourselves at a loss where to fix our choice amidst so varied and abundant a store of wealth. Were we to mention the most exciting scene in this volume, it would be "the trial of the bishops." But as one of the most instuctive examples of the tenacity with which the sheerest whim, when once adopted as an article of faith, will keep its hold on an entire body of learned, conscientious, and highly intelligent men, we should refer to the notion of "the divine right of kings," the history of which we trace in both of these volumes. On this conceit, churchmen and politicians of great learning and talents discoursed like fools, if we may speak plainly, and no reasoning nor facts could force the least glimmer of light into their understanding, till their eyes were torn open, and held open, by violence. It was a case parallel with what we sometimes meet with, at the present day, in the grave pleadings for "the holy Apostolical succession, and the divine authority of modern Episcopacy,"—not to mention other fancies that are first adopted in an emergency, and then cherished with a desperateness proportioned to their

Digitized by Google

manifest absurdity: *credo, quia impossibile est.* In such cases, necessity, downright practical necessity, has more to do in correcting speculative folly, and in enlightening the mind, "than our philosophy dreams of." All honor to necessity, the efficient teacher when all other instructers fail!

3. The Dramatic Works of William Shakspeare; with a Life of the Poet, and Notes, original and selected. Boston: Phillips & Sampson. 1847. In seven 8vo volumes.

We notice this as the best American edition we have seen of Shakspeare's Dramas; and as one that may be had at low price, considering the size of the work. The text, carefully collated with the most authentic copies, is printed on large type, and accompanied with historical Prefaces to the several Plays, and with Notes succinct yet sufficient to explain the obsolete phrases, difficult sentences, and obscure allusions. It is just what the reader of Shakspeare needs,—no more, and no less.

4. Essay on the Union of Church and State. By Baptist Wriothesley Noel, M. A., &c. &c. New York: Harper & Brothers, &c. 1849. 12mo. pp. 442.

This publication has excited much interest in England, and has been eagerly sought for in our own country. Part of this interest is doubtless owing to the reputation and standing of the author. Closely connected with the English nobility, if not belonging to it, and for nearly a quarter of a century a distinguished clergyman of the National Church, eminent alike for piety and talents, his secession from the Establishment could not fail of making a strong impression on the religious world, and the reasons he might assign for the step were sure at least to command attention. On looking into his volume, we find that its contents are such as to enhance rather than to allay the feelings with which its appearance was awaited. It is the most complete exposition we have seen of the evils involved in the constitution of the English Church, and in her union with the civil authority of the realm. While the author bears testimony to the piety and worth of many ministers and of some prelates of the Establishment, he lays open with an unsparing hand the rottenness of the system, and exemplifies the pernicious and corrupting influence it exerts. This he does with a grave and dignified earnestness which addresses itself directly to the conscience, and with a precision which could have been attained only by long and familiar acquaintance with the facts.

Considerable space is devoted to the argument against all union of Church and State. His objections are drawn from the manner

Digitized by Google

in which the civil government is composed, or the character and objects of its administrators, from the history of the experiment in England and otherwhere, from the better results of the contrary practice wherever it has been tried, and from the Scriptures. Some parts of this argument will not perhaps be of great interest to readers in our country, where the minds of people generally have long been settled on the debated question. But, in the conduct of his argument, the author has introduced a multitude of facts which will take as strong a hold of the public attention in America as in his own country. His illustrations of the manner in which the Union of Church and State has actually operated from the time of Henry VIII., downwards, his exposure of what the Church has actually been under this condition, opens to us some of the most loathsome pages in modern ecclesiastical history; and, when once read, they will never be forgotten. The same may be said with respect to his examination of the canons of the Church, the arrogant claims it puts forth, the practices it enjoins so contrary to the examples and precepts of the Apostles, the lives of many of its ministers and dignitaries, the luxury in which it keeps a part of its clergy, and the destitution to which it condemns the rest, and the obstacles which all these evils interpose against any effectual reform till the Establishment ceases to be an establishment. We commend his treatment of all these points to such of our readers as feel an interest in the question of Episcopacy; for many of the considerations bear equally on the pretensions of the Episcopal Church whether in this country or in England.

He concludes his work by saying, "The union of the Churches with the State is doomed. Condemned by reason and religion, by Scripture and by experience, how can it be allowed to injure the nation much longer? All the main principles upon which it rests are unsound. Its State-salaries, its supremacy, its patronage, its compulsion of payments for the support of religion, are condemned by both the precedents and the precepts of the word of God. We have seen that it sheds a blighting influence upon prelates, incumbents, curates, and other members of churches. It adds little to the number of pastors, it distributes them with a wasteful disregard to the wants of the population, and it pays least those whom it ought to pay most liberally. It excludes the Gospel from thousands of parishes; it perpetuates corruptions in doctrine; it hinders all scriptural discipline; it desecrates the ordinances of Christ, confounds the church and the world, foments schism among Christians, and tempts the ministers of Christ both in and out of the Establishment to be eager politicians. Further, it embarrasses successive governments, main-

Digitized by Google

tains one chief element of revolution in the country, renders the reformation of the Anglican churches hopeless, hinders the progress of the Gospel throughout the kingdom, and strengthens all the corrupt papal Establishments of Europe." (p. 440.) The exhortation in which he calls on all the Christians of England, (we perceive, however, that he means only the *Orthodox* Christians,) to engage in dissolving the unnatural union, affords a fair example of the earnest and dignified spirit of his book: "Above all, let us take care to fulfil this duty in a Christian spirit. No religious cause requires irreligious means for its advancement. Let us disgrace ourselves by no railing, condemn all personal invective, and be guilty of no exaggeration, for these are the weapons of the weak and the unprincipled; but, uniting with all those who love the Redeemer, let us recognize with gratitude every work of the Spirit within the Establishment as well as without it. And with much prayer, with constant dependence on the Holy Spirit, with a supreme desire to glorify God, and with an abundant exercise of faith, hope, and love, which are our appropriate armor in every conflict, let us persevere in our efforts till the blessing of God renders our triumph a decisive step toward the evangelization of the world." (p. 442.)

5. Historical Sketches and Incidents, illustrative of the Establishment and Progress of Universalism in the State of New York. Second Series. By S. R. Smith. Buffalo: James S. Leavitt, Publisher. 1848. 18mo. pp. 248.

The first volume, or series, of Mr. Smith's "Historical Sketches and Incidents," was noticed in our pages, some years ago. The second Series, though it has been out of the press nearly a twelvemonth, was overlooked by us till recently; an oversight which, for our readers' sake, we regret, but not on our own account, since the delay has reserved for us a fresh pleasure, which we have just enjoyed in the perusal. It begins, where the former left off, at the commencement of the year 1818; and, like that, it is composed of personal anecdotes, reminiscences, and accounts of the general state of affairs among the Universalists in the central and western parts of New York, at several subsequent periods. It would be very inadequate praise to say that the author has furnished important materials towards a history of our Connection in the parts of country mentioned; he has presented a picture which recalls the past in its own lights and shades. His sympathies hold as lively as ever with those "times that tried men's souls;" and indeed, how could it be otherwise with one who was a principal actor and sufferer in the scenes that marked the day miscalled of "small things"? Small things they may

Digitized by Google

have seemed, in the eyes of the world; but the results show that, in reality, they were great,—far greater than much which, for the time being, is more "highly esteemed among men." It is the ordinance of God that they who prepare the way for a rich harvest, should "sow in tears;" and where the condition is evaded, the harvest, as a general rule, fails. Amateur exquisites, on a farm, make a fine show, but have small crops. As we ourselves stood, at the same period, in circumstances analagous, having had some share in the trials, we trust we may be permitted to express our thanks to God for the fiery ordeal through which the early Universalists passed, and from which they are not as yet wholly relieved in all places.

It may be useful, at the present time, to revert occasionally to the universal tide of bitterness that the first preachers of our faith everywhere met with, as it justifies much of the severity which they used in their remarks, and which is now frequently misapprehended in our change of relations. The sober historical truth is, there was an ungodly and unprincipled abuse studiously and systematically carried out against them, which it was their duty to rebuke, as much as it was their duty to reprove any other sin. In this neighborhood, and at the present day, it is hardly possible to conceive of the united arrogance and baseness, (we do not use too strong a term,) with which they were treated by the churches and ministers in general. We do not say that they never fell into the error of retorting; we think that many of them were inclined to regard the sin of the church, from which they suffered so severely, as the giant sin of the age; but if so, what was their fault compared with the guilt of the offenders! If justice is to be done to the memory of the parties, let it be equal justice.

Speaking of the state of things in Central New York, 1818, Mr. Smith says, "Let me ask the reader, what he would be likely to think of a class of men, [ministers,] with whom his professional pursuits frequently brought him in contact, and who, during five years, should but *twice*, show him any but the most constrained civility? To this, he must add the consideration that he is not accused of any moral offence, that he is acknowledged to be a peaceable citizen, and admitted to be diligent in his efforts to spread his opinions among mankind. Let him still add, that his views are constantly misrepresented; that his motives are called in question; that the influence of his principles is affirmed to be dangerous; and that in a thousand ways he is openly and maliciously insulted. Let him pass through all this, and feel it, as any man with a soul in him would feel—and he will then be in a condition to put the question seriously to himself, whether his charity for the pretensions of his opponents, had not sensibly

Digitized by Google

diminished. Let him also ask himself, whether it be not very likely, that in meeting and rebutting their assaults and slanders, he would dispense with the smoother forms of rebuke, and 'call things by their right names?' And is it not quite probable, that he might become excited on the subject, and in his zeal to justify himself and expose the sophistry, misrepresentations, and hostility of his persecutors, unnecessarily widen the distance between them, by ill-timed or uncalled for severity?

The above remarks are made with reference to the prevailing opinion, that the older preachers of Universalism were unmercifully severe upon other denominations. And it is very true that they were so. But they are by no means remarkable for severity at the present time. The reasons of this great change are quite obvious—the causes which inspired, and for a season kept in vigorous operation the talent for rebuke, have nearly all passed away." (pp. 35, 36.)

Article XVII.

Religious and Ecclesiastical Affairs.

I. Rise and Progress of Domestic Missions.

Domestic Missions, or, as they are now styled, Home Missions, form an important part in the machinery of almost every denomination. As the Universalist Churches are beginning to engage in this work with some degree of regularity and system, it has been supposed that a view of Home Missions, as managed by others, might prove to be neither uninteresting nor unprofitable.

The early efforts to Christianize the Indians in North America were of the character of our modern *foreign* missions, and are therefore laid out of the present case. And the meteor-like flight of Whitfield through the land, as it was the exhibition of a distinct species of Evangelism, has but a remote relation to the objects of our inquiry. Even the original planting of Methodist Societies by Wesley and his coadjutors, and that of the Universalist Societies by Murray and others, do not exactly fall within the pale of Home Missions, as at present understood.

These refer to the better and more thorough culture of ground already possessed, and to a gradual and profitable increase of ter-

Digitized by Google

ritory, rather than to sudden achievement and rapid conquest. A reference to facts will render this entirely plain.

In the early settlements of New England, churches and schools were among the first objects of the public care; and they were second in individual interest, only to the most pressing wants of food and raiment and shelter. Towns and parishes, for the most part, were the same bodies,—and a majority of votes in town-meeting elected the pastor, who, once ordained, was not easily removed, and whose support was made sure by a tax on the polls and estates of all the community. In this state of things, there was little room or occasion for what we now style Home Missions.

But, when the revolution had unsettled many minds, when discordant opinions had ripened into rival sects, when the laws were changing and uniformity could no longer be maintained,—then it was that some pastors, in small or divided places, began to be sent out as itinerant missionaries to scattered settlers who lived where no parishes could be established or preachers supported.

This plan answered a double purpose: it eked out the scanty support of the pastor, and gave a few Sabbaths preaching to those who otherwise might never have heard a sermon in a lifetime.

For example: Rev. Mr. Litchfield of Kittery, Maine, whose support had fallen fifty dollars short, by reason of new sects, was sent on a mission to Coos County, N. H., for eight weeks in the summer season, when he could best be spared from home. His dismission was thus prevented; the destitute thus supplied; and the wealthier churches which raised the money for this object were benefited by the benevolent act in which they were engaged.

In the first address of an old Home Missionary Society, published near fifty years ago, it was declared as a matter of principle, that in their selection of missionaries, they would prefer those who had some pastoral experience. Thus showing that the institution was to aid the Pastors, as well as to benefit the people.

A few years of experience taught them a mode of operation more efficient and uniform than the employment of numerous itinerant missionaries. This was the plan of giving direct aid in money to a pastor whose people could not quite support him. Several such missionary grants were made thirty years ago, and found to be so useful that the system became general;—and these operations have been increased steadily to the present time.

For the several steps of their progress we have no room—but the following statement of Home Missionary operations in a sin-

Digitized by Google

gle denomination, at the present time, will show one of the elements of their strength, and at the same time may show how easily something of the same kind can be done elsewhere.

The Maine Missionary Society employs 91 Orthodox ministers, at various amounts of aid, varying from 30 dollars to 400 dollars each, and expends about $11,000 per annum. When this society was formed, there were only 39 churches of that order in the State, who could support a minister without aid from Mission Societies; now 89,—50 churches having become able, while 110 still receive aid.

The New Hampshire Missionary Society employs 46 such missionaries, and collects 6,700 dollars.

The Vermont Society has 42 missionaries, and raises 5,700 dollars.

In Connecticut, 41 missionaries, and 22,800 dollars raised; 17,000 of which goes to swell the treasury of the American Home Missionary Society.

Rhode Island, 10 missionaries, expense 1,900 dollars.

In Massachusetts, 42 missionaries. The cost of these missions in the Commonwealth is 7,000 dollars; sent to the American Society, 18,000 dollars.—One other fact is worthy of note here. The churches aided, have contributed about $1,000 for Home Missions, and $2,000 for other objects.

Thus it will be seen, that 272 clergymen of one denomination in New England, are kept in their places and supported by means of missionary grants. What effect this has on the stability and influence of that body, is easily imagined, but not easily overstated.

We have only room to add, that the American Home Missionary Society, (Presbyterian and Congregational,) employs 1,000 missionaries, including the above.

It is to be hoped that some able writer will lay before our churches suitable plans for the cultivation of our extensive and promising missionary field. The harvest truly is plenteous, but the laborers are few.

II. Contents of the principal Theological Reviews, etc., with the omission of such articles as are of no general interest.

1. *Bibliotheca Sacra and Theological Review.* Feb., 1849. 1. Demosthenes and Massillon. (Condensed, by J. B. Lyman, from a French work of Dr. Theremin.) Valuable for true views of eloquence. 2. Doctrine of the Resurrection of the Dead. (Translation of De Wette's Comment. on 1 Cor. xv.) For the most part, a true exposition of St. Paul's meaning, though here

Digitized by Google

and there accommodated to the church-doctrine, especially in making the Apostle treat of the resurrection of only a part of mankind,—"the righteous." 3. Of the Natural Proofs of the Immortality of the soul. (By Geo. I. Chace.) Not quite conclusive. 4. The Deluges of Ogyges and Deucalion. (Translated, by Rev. J. Richards, from the French.) A good historical argument for the Greek tradition of Noah's Deluge. 5. The Greek Drama. (By R. D. C. Robbins.) On the relation of poetry to the condition of the Greeks; the origin and nature of the Greek drama; and on the Greek theatre and mode of representing plays. Good. 6. The Spirit of a Scholar. (By Prof. S. G. Brown.) 7. English Puritanism in the times of the Commonwealth. (By Rev. Ed. D. Neill.) An Abstract of Sprigge's "Anglia Rediviva," &c. 1647. Somewhat interesting, as an old document. 8. Dorner's History of the Doctrine of the Person of Christ. (A brief account, by Prof. Henry B. Smith, of Dr. Dorner's German work.) We should infer that the original is one of the German speculative histories, not strictly historico-historical. 9. Remarks on certain erroneous methods and principles in Biblical Criticism. (By Prof. B. B. Edwards.) Good, but not very remarkable. 10. Notices of New Publications, and Miscellanies.

2. *The New Englander.* Feb., 1849. 1. The New Earth; —a very good rhetorical developement of the idea that our globe is becoming "a new earth," by the culture of its surface, the facilities of communication, the erection of cities and works of art, and by the improvement of its inhabitants. 2. The World made for Man;—an ingenious and interesting argument for this proposition; but perhaps one-sided. 3. Pioneer History;—a notice of Hildreth's account of the first Examination of the Ohio Valley, and early settlement of the Northwest Territory. 4. Congregational Singing;—advocating, and giving directions for, the practice. 5. The Biglow Papers;—a very handsome notice of this humorous and satirical work. 6. The Italian Revolutions in 1848;—an important historical sketch by an eye-witness. 7. Monuments of the Mississippi Valley;—a review, or abstract, of the first volume of the Smithsonian Contributions to Knowledge;—interesting. 8. Congregationalism, its History and Principles. 9. Dr. Stone's Memoir of the Life of Dr. Milnor. 10. Eliot's History of Harvard College. 11. The Stranger in the Episcopal Church;—a liberal, gentleman-like, cutting review of Bp. Burgess's Tract of this title. 12. The English Reviews, and the French Revolution;—a conclusive argument, against the Edinburgh and London Quarterly Reviews, for the necessity of revolutions in the progress of States, and in justification of the

Digitized by Google

recent one in France, though not of some of the principles and ideas on which it has been conducted.

3. *The Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review.* Jan., 1849. 1. American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, in relation to Slavery,—a plea that the Board cannot meddle with the existence of slavery in the Missions, and moreover that slave-holding is no sin. 2. The Apostolic Constitutions,—a review of Dr. Chase's late edition of that work, with special reference to the offices of Presbyters, Bishops, &c., in the ancient church; well done. 3. The History of Catechizing,—from Augustine to the Synod of Dort; interesting. 4. The Free Church Pulpit,—or three volumes, just published at New York, of Sermons by divines of the Free Church of Scotland; some good suggestions on sermonizing. 5. Croly on Divine Providence,—a pretty thorough cutting up of a fantastic work. 6. The Primitive Presbyters,—showing from Acts and the Epistles that Presbyters were the highest officers in the primitive church, and the same as Bishops; an effectual refutation, were it needed, of the Prelatical claims. 7. Davidson's Introduction to the New Testament,—a commendation of that recent English work as a learned criticism on the Four Gospels, and as a judicious examination of the several German hypotheses on the subject. 7. Quarterly List of New Publications.

4. *The Christian Examiner*, etc., for March, 1849. 1. Lücke's Dissertation on the Logos. (Translated from the German.) Valuable as a statement of the Alexandrian-Jewish notion of the Logos before St. John's time. To be continued. 2. Whipple's Essays and Reviews,—complimentary. 3. Saint Theresa and the Devotees of Spain,—in the 16th century. Very well written, and interesting. 4. Kentish's Notes on Scripture,—notice of that work; with animadversions on the decline of sacred criticism. 5. Economies,—or man's relations. Some good thoughts, which would appear better in a simpler dress. 6. Macaulay's History,—a good and well written notice of that work. 7. Religious Poetry of Modern Germany,—a warm commendation of that department of foreign literature. 8. Colman's European Agriculture,—some good suggestions on agriculture. 9. Mary Barton,—a review of that work. 10. The Unitarian Meetings,—in Boston, for the revival of religion; with some suggestions with respect to the causes of the present general decline. 11. Notices of Recent Publications. 12. Intelligence, Religious.

Digitized by Google

Article XVIII.

The Importance and Necessity of Doctrinal Preaching.

In proposing *doctrinal preaching* as the subject of the present article, I am sensible that I expose myself to much prejudice and animadversion. For various reasons, or fancied reasons, many people have contracted not only a distaste but an absolute aversion to almost all doctrinal inculcation in the pulpit. Some dislike it, because such preaching demands attention and thought, and they go to church to employ neither. They would make the Lord's day a perfect Sabbath, a season of rest to mind as well as body; and sermons to please them must be made up of little prettinesses and pleasant conceits, which require no effort to understand, and occasion no loss if they are not understood. Most devoutly do they eschew every thing that savors of work on holy days. They have a talent for passivity, and constitute excellent members of the wide-spread and fashionable sect of modern Quietists. Others have an aversion to doctrinal preaching, because it fosters, as they think, a spirit of controversy and disputation. They are great lovers of peace and union; they would have nothing uttered in the pulpit, which could give any one offence, or cross any one's speculative notions. Truth with them is of secondary importance. Hence they would have nothing preached but common-place, and the highest praise they can confer upon a sermon, is that "nobody could find fault with it." They shrink from the bold statement and the clear exposition of the doctrines of Christianity, under the timid apprehension that some one "of the contrary part," may be present to take exceptions or offence. Some, again, would have doctrinal preaching avoided, to give place to what they call moral or practical preaching. The motive by which such persons are actuated, I sincerely respect, though I am convinced that they labor under a total misapprehension of the state of the case. True, many doctrines have been preached, and most strenuously insisted upon, which, being false in fact

Digitized by Google

had no connection with morality, and could not promote a Christian life. But no one can believe that Jesus of Nazareth was from God, and yet imagine that any of his doctrines are inconsistent with the purest morality, or even unnecessary to its practice. There are others still, who complain of doctrinal preaching, only because they understand the term in a sense quite too narrow and contracted. Doctrines, according to their acceptation of the word, embrace only those special teachings which constitute the peculiarities of a sect, or the *shibboleths* of a party; as the five points of Calvinism, the doctrine of the trinity, or of the unity, of endless misery, or univeral salvation. Now one may well become weary of any or all of these, for even though they were true, they are only a part of the truth. I would take the word in a larger sense, as including all the teachings of Christ, all the doctrines of his religion, whether they relate to himself, to God, or to man; whether they refer to the divine purposes and government, or to the relations of man, his duty or destiny. To be a doctrinal preacher in the highest sense, one must embrace the whole gospel in his public ministrations, the great system of Christianity in its completeness, proportions and symmetry. He who should thus preach would thoroughly preach Christ. Finally, there are some, I think, who are opposed to doctrinal preaching, not so much because it is doctrinal, as because it is *Christian*. They allow doctrine in politics and philosophy; in religion they would have none. They cannot brook the doctrines of the cross. The speculations of the miscalled philosopher, or the idle dreams of the clairvoyant, are more grateful to them than the eternal verities of Jesus Christ.

With those who indulge in these objections and complaints against doctrinal preaching, I frankly confess, I feel no sympathy. According to all my religious convictions, doctrinal preaching stands first, and claims the highest attention. It is the basis of all. Whatever else is neglected, this should never be neglected. I maintain that doctrinal preaching is not only important but indispensably necessary;—necessary to the preacher himself and to the people who hear him; necessary to the strength and permanence of Christian societies, and to the promotion and establishment of God's truth and kingdom in the

Digitized by Google

world; necessary, in one word, to the head and the heart, the mind and morals of mankind.

I. I begin, then, by saying, that doctrinal preaching is indispensably necessary to the preacher himself; I mean to the conscientious discharge of his duty as a Christian minister. He who takes upon himself the office of a minister of Jesus Christ, occupies a peculiar and responsible position. The relation he sustains to Christ is widely different from that sustained by the scholar of Socrates or Plato to his master. It is far deeper and more important. If I believe in Christ at all, in any proper sense of the word, I must believe in him as a divinely sent and inspired Teacher. He is either this, or he is an impostor. The case admits of no alternative. One cannot open the New Testament without perceiving that Christ is not only represented and acknowledged by the Evangelists and apostles as a Teacher sent from God, and hence infallible, but that Christ himself expressly claimed this character. That he is the Messiah, the Son of God; that he came accompanied by the divine spirit and endowed with divine power; that he was qualified in all respects by knowledge and grace to be the Saviour of the world; these are facts asserted or implied on every page of the New Testament, and, with their proofs and consequences, make up its entire subject-matter.

The great, and as it seems to me, the only question for us to settle, is whether Jesus is in fact what he claimed to be. When this question is once determined in men's minds, they have necessarily arranged themselves for or against Christ and his religion. Those who sincerely receive him in the character which he claimed for himself, are Christians; and those who deny these claims, must believe him to be an impostor and his religion a lie. Such persons can have no pretensions to the Christian name. Nor is there any middle ground between these two positions. Jesus of Nazareth is or is not the Messiah, the Son of God, and consequently an infallible teacher. To say that we believe in *some* of his teachings and not in others, is obviously nothing to the purpose. The sheerest infidel in Christendom must acknowledge as much faith as this. In this sense it would be an easy task to prove the soberest Christian a believer in Mahomet, Jo. Smith, or Davis.

Digitized by Google

It is difficult for any man to talk much without saying some *truth*, and truth is to be believed, though uttered by the father of lies himself. Yet here is the difference: I believe in what Mahomet, or Socrates, or any other man may have here and there said, not because he said it, but *because it is true.* I believe what Jesus Christ said is true, *because he said it.* In other words, Mahomet and Socrates are fallible men; Jesus Christ is to me a divine and infallible teacher. So clear and convincing are the proofs of his divine mission, that I believe in him as I believe in God. His word is to me the word of God. In him I behold the Father. He is to me "the way, the truth, and the life;" and meekly, and with a child-like spirit would I sit at his feet and learn of him. I ask no other proof of the truth of any proposition than that Christ has taught it. This is to me equal to the clearest demonstration. Henceforth I feel and know it is true, because I know him to be so. Christ is also an authoritative teacher; i. e. he speaks not with doubt and hesitancy, but as with the highest inspiration, with infallible certainty. If he was the Son of God, as he claimed to be, this was not only natural but proper. If he were not the Son of God, then was he, as I have before said, an impostor. But to profess faith in him, or to be called by his name, while one regards him as an impostor, is absurd. Only under the deep conviction that Jesus Christ is from God, and therefore worthy of implicit faith, can a profession of Christianity be raised to dignity, or possess any moral significance.

What is it, then, to be a preacher of the gospel, or a minister of Christ? What but, first, to believe that Christ is the Son of God, a divinely appointed and inspired teacher, all whose words are true; and, secondly, to preach the doctrines of Christ, in Christ's name and by his authority? Any thing short of this is but mockery, as it is neither being his minister, nor preaching his gospel. As a minister of Christ, one has no right to turn aside a hair's breadth from the line of the Great Master's teachings. He can have no philosophical speculations, no clairvoyant dreams, no transcendental fancies to set forth. His work is both plainer and better; it is to preach "Jesus Christ and him crucified."

Digitized by Google

I am well aware how this confines and cramps some free and aspiring spirits, who have assumed the name and place of Christian ministers. To them the gospel is narrow, limited and poor. It is wanting in length and breadth, in depth and spirituality. It is imperfect and shallow. In all respects, indeed, it is far from being what a divine revelation should be, and is little better than a tissue of shreds and patches of truth, interwoven with a thousand mistakes and errors, from which all the wisdom of transcendentalism and clairvoyance together can scarcely separate it.

Such professed ministers of Christ I sincerely pity. Their position is eminently unnatural and false; nor do I see any means by which they can escape from it, but to arise in the little integrity they may have left, and abandon at once a profession which they can but dishonor. There *are* men who are not ashamed of the gospel,—let them preach it—men with minds not less enlarged by thought or ripened by experience than those favored individuals who despise it. To them Christianity is not only true, but its truths are so rich and varied, so adapted to man's nature and wants, so replete with hopes, joys and consolations, its views are so broad and grand, and stretch out so vastly in every direction, that instead of complaining of it as narrow, they only lament the feebleness of their own powers to comprehend it. Some of these men have studied the gospel their life long, but instead of shrinking, as most greatness does on a nearer approach, it swells evermore upon their vision, and like the Alps towers in its grandeur and sublimity, not only above their reach, but up to the very heavens. From my heart do I pity the man whose soul feels itself fettered and cramped by the gospel. I recognize it as an unhappy omen, not for the gospel, but for his soul. It is that, I suspect, which is dwarfed, and its sense of confinement, its want of freedom, comes not from external pressure but from internal derangement. It cannot enjoy a free and healthy action; if it did, the gospel would be as grateful to it and as indispensable as light to the eye or air to the lungs.

Though I have dwelt so long on this point, its importance compels me to crave indulgence in some farther remarks. I cannot leave it without attempting to show

Digitized by Google

more clearly that to be a preacher of the gospel at all, is to be emphatically a doctrinal preacher. This follows from the fact that the gospel is preëminently a system of doctrines. To show this I shall argue,—

1. From the nature of the case. It is impossible to conceive of any system of philosophy, politics or religion, which does not contain some fundamental principles. It is so in all science, true or false. These principles, whatever they may be, underlie the whole, and form the basis on which the superstructure necessarily rests. They cannot be removed, or changed, without destroying or affecting the whole. It must be so with Christianity. It has its elements, its fundamental truths, without which it would no longer be Christianity. These truths are fundamental doctrines, and they must be preached, or Christianity is not preached. The professed minister of Christ, who neglects to inculcate them, neglects his duty and dishonors his profession. He no more preaches the gospel than the mathematician, who should spend his time in talking upon animal magnetism, would teach geometry.

Besides, it seems to me preposterous to suppose that Christ came into the world as a divine Ambassador, to teach *nothing*, or nothing worthy of being preached. No man can believe that Jesus is the Son of God, without at the same time believing his word to be not only truth, but truth of such a nature, so high, so important, so indispensable to man's well-being, as to justify the divine mission in which it was announced. If Christ came, as he himself declared, "to bear witness to the truth," I am not ashamed, I confess, to consecrate my life and all my humble powers to the promulgation of that truth. Let it go out; it is the light of the world. Let it be preached; it is the means of man's redemption.

2. But it is not from the nature of the case alone that I maintain the gospel to be a system of doctrines. The history of Christianity also proves it. When I see a religion coming forth from the manger of Bethlehem or the despised village of Nazareth, preached by an humble mechanic, without rank or fortune, without learning or friends, or indeed any external advantages, to commend it to mankind; when I see it not only despising, but utterly forbidding, all resort to force, and throwing itself confidently

Digitized by Google

upon its own proofs and truth, and thus winning its way against prejudice the most inveterate, and an opposition the most unscrupulous the world ever saw, and turning, at every step, defeat itself into victory; when I see it, after the crucifixion of its founder, going out beyond the limits of Palestine, and, in the hands of a few poor unlettered fishermen, spreading itself over the most civilized and intellectual parts of the earth; when I see the institutions of men, time-worn and gray, changing under its influence, and the temples and altars of old religions crumbling to dust before it; I cannot but ask myself, what it was that was thus spread abroad, and that wrought such astonishing results. Can we hesitate as to the answer? What was it but the doctrines of Christ, the great truths which he had preached and which he commissioned his apostles to carry out through the earth and to preach to every creature? These doctrines, introduced and accompanied by miracles, and thus rendered divinely authoritative, were received into the hearts of men, and through faith became the source of a new and truer life. Under the influence of these doctrines the heathen came forth from darkness into light. Old things passed away and all things became new. They knew the truth, and the truth made them free. Without doctrines, the Christian religion would have been a nullity; without divine authority, its doctrines would have been as powerless to reform the world as the speculations of philosophy have always proved to be.

3. But I rest not on the nature of the case alone, nor on the deductions from history. I appeal to facts. I refer directly to the public labors of Christ and his apostles. I assert that the founder of our religion was eminently doctrinal in his preaching, and so were his apostles after him. Never was there a teacher on earth more distinguished for the inculcation of important doctrines than Jesus of Nazareth. His life was consecrated to teaching. His lessons embraced the whole range of moral and spiritual truth, necessary for man's welfare, or perhaps possible for his understanding. They extended from God to man, and exhibited the nature and relations of both, with the duties, hopes, fears, solaces and joys belonging to the latter. But let us glance at some of the doctrines of Christ.

Digitized by Google

He taught that there is a God, an infinite, personal spirit, the creator and governor of the universe. I do not mean that this was original with Christ, but he ever taught it, and it is fundamental in his religion. Without such a Being, indeed, Christianity would be clearly impossible, and all religion and religious feeling unnatural and delusive.

He taught the moral nature and attributes of God; that he is good, infinitely good; that he is love; that he is kind to the unthankful and the evil; that he loves even his enemies, and blesses those that curse him, and does good to those that hate him; and, finally, that he will have all men come to the knowledge of the truth and be saved. He taught that God is not only our creator and governor, but also our *Father*. In this relation Christ always presented him; under this endearing name he ever appears in the gospel. He has a father's love for the human race, and a father's interest in its welfare. From this love, this interest, the gospel, with all its treasures of grace and salvation, came forth. "Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins." "And we have seen and do testify that the Father sent the Son to be the Saviour of the world." Christ therefore taught that, as the Son of God, he came from the Father as his special messenger, anointed and sent, to reveal the Father, and to accomplish the divine will in the salvation of mankind. For the attainment of this grand, this sublime purpose, Christ taught that the Father had appointed him to a kingdom and given him all power in heaven and in earth. He also taught that in the process of this kingdom, the dead would be raised incorruptible, and that having brought all in moral subjection to himself, he would ultimately deliver up the kingdom to the Father, and God be all in all. In connection with these great doctrines relating to God and himself, the divine purposes and plan, Christ inculcated the whole range of moral duties,—repentance and reformation, love to God and love to our fellow-creatures. On these I need not dwell here. They rest on those doctrines just named, and their kindred doctrines, and complete the scheme of truths which constitute the gospel.

I shall not be understood to intend this as a full state-

Digitized by Google

ment of the doctrines of the gospel; far from it. I wish only to show that the gospel is a system of doctrines, and that he who will preach the gospel must be a doctrinal preacher. Nor need I add that these and their kindred doctrines are taught by Christ and his apostles with authority. By miracles and prophecy, Christ proved himself to be the Son of God, and after his resurrection from the dead, those whom he sent forth to preach his gospel, carried their miraculous credentials of their apostleship with them. Christianity has always been preached and received as an authoritative religion, and he who now denies it this character, virtually denies at the same time that it is a divine revelation; for it is impossible to conceive of any higher proof of the truth of any proposition than that *God has said it.* He who could question the truth of what he believes God has spoken, would make God himself a liar!

Having now shown that the gospel is a system of doctrines, I have only to add that the apostles and other ministers of Christ were bound to preach them. Christ, as I have repeatedly said, claimed to have come from God and to speak God's words. "My doctrine is not mine, but his that sent me." "I have not spoken of myself, but the Father which sent me, he gave me commandment what I should say and what I should speak." As Christ himself had been sent forth by the Father, so he sent forth his disciples, as he said in his great prayer, "As thou hast sent me into the world, so have I also sent them into the world." They had been with Christ during his whole ministry, they had listened to his teachings, seen his miracles, and learned his doctrines. These they were to preach; and that they might be perfectly furnished for their great work, they were to receive, and did actually receive, the Comforter, the Holy Ghost, "whom," said Jesus, "the Father shall send in my name; he shall teach you all things and shall bring all things to your remembrance whatsoever I have said to you." Not only so, but being "sanctified through the truth," they were to be acknowledged as Christ's ministers. "Verily I say unto you, he that receiveth whomsoever I send receiveth me; and he that receiveth me receiveth him that sent me." Their teaching also was to be authoritative. The last great

Digitized by Google

commission, and the authority on which it rested, was, "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye, therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you."

That the apostles went forth under this commission; and that in all their labors and sufferings they regarded themselves and publicly claimed to be Christ's ministers; that they wrought miracles by Christ's power, and taught in Christ's name,—these are facts, which stand out so plainly on the face of the New Testament records, that to introduce proofs here might almost seem superfluous. The apostles declared that God had committed to them the ministry and word of reconciliation, that they were "ambassadors for Christ," that they were "debtors both to the Greeks and the barbarians, both to the wise and the unwise," that they were determined "to know nothing" among men "but Jesus Christ and him crucified;" and finally that necessity was laid upon them, yea, wo was unto them "if they preached not the gospel." Such were the views and convictions they themselves entertained of their own duties and responsibilities, as ministers of Christ, and in accordance with them were their whole lives. As time wore away and their own season of labor drew to a close, they appointed others to carry on the great work which Christ had committed to their hands. A specimen of the various charges which they solemnly enjoined upon their successors may be found in the epistles to Timothy and Titus. They were "to hold fast the form of sound words" which they had learned from the apostles; they were to "study to approve themselves unto God," rightly dividing the word of truth: they were charged in the most solemn manner "before God and the Lord Jesus Christ" "to preach the word, to be instant in season and out of season," to "meditate upon these things, to give themselves wholly to them, that their profiting might appear to all; and finally they were to "take heed to themselves and to the doctrine, and to continue in them."

Nor did the apostles stop here. Not only did they prescribe the ministerial duties of their younger brethren and immediate successors, but they also laid down the rules to

Digitized by Google

be observed by these successors in the appointment of others who were to assist and follow them. Timothy was left at Ephesus to "charge some that they teach no other doctrine," and also to ordain bishops and deacons, while Titus remained at Crete to "set in order things that were wanting, and to ordain elders in every city." The character and duties of these bishops and elders were also clearly prescribed, and among them always stood foremost their Christian faith, integrity and ability to teach. They must "hold fast the faithful word as they had been taught, that they might be able by sound doctrine both to exhort and convince the gainsayers."

Such then is the manner in which this subject lies in the New Testament. And if what has now been said be true, if, indeed, the whole course of the preceding reasonings be not fallacious, the necessity of doctrinal preaching, in order to the conscientious discharge of the Christian minister's duty, must be apparent to all. The minister of Christ has but one master; he can know no other. There is to him but one Lord and one faith, and if he will do his duty he must adhere rigidly to the doctrines of Christ. There is necessity laid upon him, yea, wo to him if he preach not the gospel. I know not what others may think, but with the language of the prophet before me, I would boldly, emphatically say, let the philosopher speculate and the dreamer dream on, but in the name of all that is sacred, let him who has the word of the Lord speak that word faithfully. "What is the chaff to the wheat?" If the gospel be of God, let us preach it "in season, out of season," for then is it not only true, but it is the very truth, and all the truth, that, as moral and religious beings, we need to know. If we no longer believe the gospel of Christ to be of God, and worthy of all acceptation, then let us honestly renounce the imposture, and not meanly add insult to imposition, by calling ourselves the ministers of Christ, in whom we do not believe, and professing to preach his gospel, which, on this supposition, is a lie!

II. I now proceed, in the second place, to show that doctrinal preaching is indispensably necessary to the people. But having spent so much time on the preceding topic, I must be brief on this; and fortunately the nature of the subject is such as to render any large discussion

Digitized by Google

unnecessary. If I have succeeded in showing that doctrinal preaching is necessary to the conscientious discharge of the minister's duty, it cannot require much argument to prove that it is, in a still higher sense, indispensable to all the great interests of the Christian life, whether in minister or people. Preaching, it will be remembered, is not an end, but only a means to an end. The Christian ministry was appointed not for its own sake but for a far higher and nobler purpose. It was to be an istrument in the hand of God, for diffusing the gospel through the world. And the necessity of its existence and labors, as well as of the coming of Christ himself, and the whole scheme of redemption, is to be found ultimately in the ignorance and sinfulness of mankind. To remove these tremendous evils, to enlighten the intellect and the conscience, to sanctify the heart and save man,—this was the great end of the gospel and all its means and appliances. Hence it follows that the necessity under which the minister of Christ is laid to preach the gospel, is to be found ultimately in the still deeper necessity that the gospel should be heard, believed and obeyed by all.

No man, it seems to me, can believe that Jesus of Nazareth is the Son of God, and his religion therefore divine, without at the same time believing it is to the last degree important to human well-being and happiness. The long preparation carried on through successive ages, its final introduction through the Son of God himself, attended by the most astonishing prophetic and miraculous powers, all betoken it a religion of no ordinary import, and one that demands and should receive universal attention. It is worthy of all acceptation. It was also designed by its divine author to be spread over the whole earth, and to enter into every heart and become the highest element in the moral culture of every soul. To this end was the Christian ministry appointed, and received that most solemn charge, to go out into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature. There is need, then, that all should become acquainted with the gospel; for it is, as the apostle says, "the power of God unto salvation to every one that believes." And here rises into view the unspeakable importance of having the gospel faithfully preached. As the great moral and spiritual means of regenerating

Digitized by Google

man, it operates chiefly through knowledge and faith. To know the truth; to believe the truth: this is the only method disclosed to us by which we may be wise and introduced into the kingdom of God. "If ye continue in my word," said the great Master, "then are ye my disciples indeed, and ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free." St. Paul declares that God "will have all men saved and come to the knowledge of the truth." So he teaches that faith in the gospel is the means of salvation: "By grace are ye saved through faith." "Because God hath from the beginning chosen you to salvation through sanctification of spirit and belief of the truth." It is a constant doctrine of the New Testament indeed that the knowledge of God and of Christ, belief in God and Christ, the knowledge of the gospel and belief in it, are indispensable to the salvation which Christianity proffers. The poor idolater in central Asia or Africa is now neither the wiser, better, nor happier for Christ's having come and brought life and immortality to light. He is still "without God and without hope in the world." To the believing alone is Christ precious, even in Christian lands. They, only, know his unsearchable riches, and find in his religion an exhaustless fountain of joy and consolation.

But if the knowledge and belief of the gospel and its divine truths, is so infinitely important, the question naturally arises, by what means can it be most successfully diffused? Two methods obviously exist: the Holy Scriptures, and the living ministry. I design no comparison of these. In the apostolic age, while the New Testament was but just written, and ministers were divinely inspired, the Christian ministry constituted almost the only means of teaching the truth. To this St. Paul therefore referred in the following passage. Having said that "whosoever calleth upon the name of the Lord, shall be saved," he proceeds to inquire, "How then shall they call on him in whom they have not believed? And how shall they believe on him of whom they have not heard? And how shall they hear without a preacher? And how shall they preach except they be sent?" Christian knowledge and faith imply Christian instruction, and Christian instruction, in turn, a Christian teacher. If there be no Christian teacher, or what is equivalent to it, he does not teach any Christian

Digitized by Google

doctrines, whence are we to expect Christian instruction? I do not here forget the Bible, and more and more do I appreciate its unspeakable value, and thank God for it. That holy book of itself is able to make one wise unto salvation. And the living ministry is now valuable no further than it explains, illustrates, and enforces its divine truths.

But I need pursue this topic no farther. If the gospel be true, it is a matter of the highest concern, and should be universally known and believed. In the apostles' days, Paul counted "all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus," his Lord. And when we consider what the gospel is, what it teaches of God, of his character and government, of human duty and destiny, it is impossible that any candid mind can reflect upon it without a deep and growing conviction that, of all subjects, it has the highest claims upon our attention, and demands to be taught in the clearest, the fullest, and the most emphatic manner. To be ignorant here, is to be ignorant of what most nearly concerns the human soul and all its more spiritual interests and its future prospects. To know the truth here, is to pass from darkness to light and from death to life. "This is eternal life," says the divine Teacher, "to know thee the only true God and Jesus Christ whom thou has sent."

Before passing from this subject I must offer a few remarks upon the intimate connection existing between doctrinal and ethical or practical preaching. Were we to listen to what is so frequently uttered around us, we should easily conclude that preaching the doctrines of Christ is somehow unfriendly, or at least useless, to the interests of morality. No greater mistake is possible. I will venture the assertion that there is not a single moral precept, expressed or implied, in the whole gospel, which does not rest ultimately upon some Christian doctrine. The principles of morality are not independent, but necessarily fall back upon some fundamental truth; they rise out of relations and connections; and these truths and relations must be understood, or the duty required is without reason, and consequently exposed to suspicion and distrust. Hence it is impossible to preach morality in any but a dogmatic way, without also preaching the doctrines which constitute at once its basis and sanction.

Digitized by Google

The very motives for the performance of any duty are to be found in the doctrines upon which that duty rests. We are required, for instance, to love God with all the heart. But love is an affection that does not flow forth at an arbitrary command. It will not be forced. In vain, therefore, will the minister or moralist preach love to God, until he can show that God is worthy of love; i. e. that he possesses such a character, and sustains such relations, and has done and is doing that for us, which lays us under the highest obligations, and calls for the deepest gratitude and warmest affections of the heart. To represent God as a monster of hatred and injustice, and then command one to love him, would be as futile as it would be blasphemous. But let him be held forth, as he is in truth, as a Being of infinite moral excellence, who combines in himself all that is good and great, all that deserves love or can command adoration and trust, and to love him becomes at once a duty and a privilege. To tell what God is, to portray his moral character, to exhibit the relations he sustains to us, the government he is exercising over us, and the destiny for which he created us, is to preach doctrine; and doctrine, let me add, compared with which all other is unimportant. For just as you represent the divine Being, will you shape your whole religion, doctrinal and practical.

But let us take one instance more of the dependence of of moral upon doctrinal preaching. We are commanded to love our enemies, to bless them that curse us, and do good to them that hate us. Is there no doctrine of the New Testament upon which this rests? Is it an arbitrary requirement, or does it lead us back to some fundamental principle of the gospel for its rationale? Obviously the latter. Christ taught, what few of his professed disciples now seem to apprehend, that God, the great central sun of the moral universe, loves his enemies, is kind to the unthankful and evil, blesses even those that curse him, and does good to those that hate him. To be good and happy, men must be like God; and hence the duty of love to enemies, and hence, too, the divine method of "overcoming evil with good." Let the fact that God loves his enemies, be for a moment denied, and this Christian duty with all its train of hallowed and peaceful consequences falls to the ground, and the spirit of revenge and hate goes out unfettered and

Digitized by Google

unrebuked. Then the gospel is a lie, and heaven is the creation of a dream, and hell, with its demoniac passions, its tortures and anguish, is alone real. But grant, on the other hand, that the gospel is true, and God becomes the eternal Father, whose goodness and love embrace a world of sinners, and are perpetually operating by a thousand means to assimilate all moral natures to Him, who is at once their author and their "everlasting portion."

No; doctrinal preaching cannot be dispensed with, and least of all, it seems to me, by him who would secure the great practical ends of the gospel—the *virtue* and *happiness* of mankind. Men must know God before they can love him. They must be made acquainted with the truth before they can honor or obey it. All the grounds of duty and the motives which urge to it, must be sought in the doctrines of the gospel, and he who forgets this may as well preach Plato as Jesus Christ. Morality, when thus dissevered from its root, ceases to be properly Christian, and loses its divine power. It may glitter and please, but its light is as cold as that reflected from an iceberg. God is the centre of the moral system, and no one knows God, except through the revelation of his Son.

Nor is doctrinal preaching less necessary to all the purposes of the Christian religion. Our hopes, our joys, our consolations,—what are they but illusions, save so far as they spring from our knowledge and belief of the truth as it is in Jesus? When I stand by the bed-side of the sick or the dying, or am called to minister the balm of consolation to the mourner, it is not dreams and airy speculations that I need, but facts, divine truths, concerning God and his holy purposes and love. Let the darkness of death gather around us or our kindred on earth, if it must; but leave us not without a Father in heaven, rob us not of a friend and a Saviour there, on whose face we may calmly look, and to whose hands we may confidently commend our spirits.

III. I remark, in the third place, that doctrinal preaching is necessary to the strength and permanence of religious societies. The opinion sometimes expressed that such preaching fosters differences and provokes contentions, seems to me at once unphilosophical and false. Nothing tends more directly or powerfully to unity of

Digitized by Google

opinion among men, than the clear statement, and the frank and manly discussion of the principles and doctrines we hold. Such a course is friendly at the same time to the interests of truth, which always gains by discussion and exposure, and is equally prejudicial to error, which expects success only through concealment and deception. Besides, Christian societies especially owe it to themselves and their profession, to be peculiarly frank and explicit on all points of doctrine and duty. Their members should not only know what they believe, but also how to maintain and defend it. To this end they should be well instructed in the character and grounds of their holy faith. Let the subtle politician avoid, if he will, all open and fearless presentation of his views and principles; let him study to be on all sides and commit himself to no interest or party; but the minister of the gospel should blush to have either no opinions at all on the great subjects of his religion, or none but such as he is afraid or ashamed to express. But grant the minister to pursue the politic but shallow course here condemned, and what would be its result? Would his hearers become enlightened in the doctrines and duties of our holy religion and confirmed in faith? Would his society become united and strong?—United? in what? I can conceive of no union till that upon which we unite is clearly understood.—Strong? What kind of strength must that be which results from men united by no common bond, and who are attached by no great interest or controlling sympathy? Such a society may indeed be numerous, and present a very formidable front, but it must be wanting in all the essential elements of true religious union and strength. It may be made up perhaps of a mass of discontented persons, who unite only for the negative purpose of opposing some prevalent opinion or practice. Or it may be composed of men who have gathered around some eloquent or attractive preacher, and who are held by the charms of his voice or style, as steel filings are held by an electro-magnet. But let this favorite preacher die or remove, or lose his voice, or adopt a different manner, and the bond of union is broken, the electric current has ceased to flow, and the society which was yesterday so imposing and prosperous, is to-day scattered and gone. I would have

Digitized by Google

men united by faith and love to the Great Teacher who lives forever, rather than to cling with a childish trust to even the greatest of his uninspired servants. A society well taught and grounded in the knowledge of the truth, and strongly bound together by a common faith and a living interest in the great cause which it involves, is little likely to be "moved from the hope of the gospel," or to forget its obligations and duties. Built up and nourished in the faithful word, it continues steadfast, and the storms and vicissitudes, incident to all institutions on earth, will ordinarily pass it over and leave it unharmed.

Both history and experience proclaim the advantages of doctrinal preaching. Those ages of the church most distinguished for it have been equally distinguished, I believe, for religious prosperity; and within our own denomination, I need not say, that almost every thing really valuable which we have ever accomplished, has been effected through boldly doctrinal inculcation. Long may it be before we shall fall back from a practice so clearly demanded by duty, and so fraught with benefits.

T. J. S.

Article XIX.

Walter Savage Landor.

The works of Walter Savage Landor. In two volumes. London: Edward Moxon. 1846.

While the works of two of the three great prose writers of England now living, have been republished in this country again and again, those of the third, and perhaps greatest, are known to us only in the editions of his London publishers. Yet, among the writings of the present age, which will best resist the effacing fingers of time and change, and be most familiar to the readers of the twenty-fifth century, we may, without hesitation, place those of

Digitized by Google

Walter Savage Landor. He will occupy, we cannot doubt, a position in the long-reaches of the future, from which he may behold his more popular contemporaries, Macaulay and Carlyle, with not uplifted eyes. The very qualities which account for the fact to which allusion has been made, (and to which we would call the attention of our enterprising publishers), will secure to Mr. Landor an audience, fit though perhaps not large, long after the mass of the most popular and widely read books of our day, shall have been swept to that ancient and immeasurable vault, to which all works essentially false or feeble, and all, however clever if fitted only to particular latitudes in the zones of time and thought, will infallibly be consigned. The pure, vigorous, compact prose of Landor may be removed no easier from the landscape of our literature, than the granite rock of Katahdn from that of the material world. Without the picturesque beauty, the easy, rolling undulation of Macaulay, the wild and furrowed sides and jagged peaks of Carlyle, it stands in simple grandeur, in its own demesne, and will, we may not question, quite as well "resist the billows and the sky." No matter if Blackwood, (happy if he can but publish one of his "Conversations,") chooses to be uncivil, and asks "Who is Mr. Landor?" and, growing communicative, informs us that the "curious, oriental tongue called *Gibberish*, no doubt, is a derivative from Gebir." What if Lord Byron designated him as "*a* Mr. Landor," whereat *the* Landor took it upon himself to be angry? The "whirligig of time will bring about his revenges."

The readers of Landor are not likely to be numerous. His topics are not such, ordinarily, as to engage the attention or enlist the sympathies of the "general." They have reference to time more than times, to the universal rather than the particular, to principles rather than to systems and measures. They will be as fresh and true, five hundred years hence as now. He will be read in the library more than in the drawing-room. No one will put him into his pocket—not merely that he is something cumbrous—to take into the fields, or to read at country inns while Betty is laying the table. In the intellectual larder his place (pardon the conceit) will be nearer Bacon than Lamb.

Mr. Landor's style is terse and forcible, but not always

Digitized by Google

faultless; he is sometimes elliptical and obscure. He has a wonderful mastery of language. He knows how to make you *think.* His depth of thought and felicity of illustration, and above all, his remarkable suggestiveness, continually arrest the attention and control the movement of his readers.

Mr. Landor's entire works are collected in the two large volumes before us. They consist of the *Imaginary Conversations*, the *Citation and Examination of William Shakspeare*, the *Pentameron*, *Pericles and Aspasia*, *Minor Prose Pieces*, and *Poems;* the latter—among which are the "Hellenics" and "Gebir"—occupying about two hundred large, double-column pages. His fame as a writer will rest chiefly upon the "Conversations'; and to these alone will our attention be directed.

Of our author's personal history we know but little. We understand that he is now about seventy-five years old; that he was educated at Oxford and intended for the army, but having imbibed republican principles he declined engaging in the profession of arms; that a liberal allowance was then proposed him on condition that he should study the law, which he also declined, although the alternative was a very material restriction of his allowance. Choosing the smaller income, he set out upon his travels in the domains of literature. He afterwards, we are informed, succeeded to the family estates, which were very large; but meeting with some vexations in the management, he left England for Italy, where he has resided, the most of the time, for the last thirty-five years. The first of the "Conversations," about forty in number, were published some thirty years ago; the last were published in 1846. They all now appear in this collected edition; the former having been revised, and, it is said, greatly improved. Here we are introduced to a goodly company of poets, philosophers, essayists and orators, statesmen and divines, warriors and quakers, scholars and courtiers. We listen to dialogues in which Dante, Chaucer, Milton, Southey, Plato, Bacon, Newton, Franklin, Montaigne, Addison, Steele, Hume, Demosthenes, Chatham, Sheridan, Cecil, Richelieu, Washington, Melancthon, Burnet, Bossuet, Wellington, Napoleon, William Penn, Porson, Chesterfield, and many others, take part. Questions of

Digitized by Google

government, war, slavery, theology—of despotism, republicanism, of Calvinism and Arminianism—of "wit, eloquence, poesy," are familiarly, ably and often thoroughly, considered and discussed. Mendicant churches and pauper aristocracies; churches, poor in every thing but titles and pretension; classes, destitute of the virtues upon which alone a genuine aristocracy can be founded, are handled without fear, favor, or affection; while all that is true, noble, and earnest and elevated in thought and life, are heartily appreciated, and lovingly and eloquently set forth. Agreeing with Mr. Landor in most things, and happy beyond measure in meeting with one who speaks so boldly against venerable wrongs, and who advocates with surpassing ability liberal opinions in politics and religion, we have to confess the appearance, something too frequent, of expressions to us totally inconsistent with the general tone and sentiment of these volumes. These, however, are chiefly in the discussions of political matters, and in his estimations of men. We think that in many cases, he must have allowed his feelings, his likes and dislikes, which are strong and wayward, to lead him astray. Differing with no one more radically than with Southey, he has eulogized him perhaps more than any other man. He does not permit his attachment for his old friend to be shaken by his apostacy. In remembrance of this, it was, perhaps, that at the "Feast of the Poets," as Leigh Hunt informs us,

> "Bob, like a gander,
> Would give 'a great genius,'—one Mr. Landor."

He seems to have an old and unaccountable grudge against the Scotch, and we look in vain to his pages for justice to that people or to their great names. The French he holds in utter contempt; but his dislike is too fierce and transparent to do any harm. Seeing that Andrew Jackson sent them a "saucy letter," in the matter of the indemnity, he forthwith began to glorify him, and verdantly asked him to abolish negro-slavery! Really liberal in his politics, and hating Pitt, we might have supposed that the strong-headed and large-hearted Fox, England's wisest and most sagacious statesman, maugre his faults, would have challenged his admiration and secured his re-

Digitized by Google

gard. Yet, he tells us that he does not choose to be mixed up with "the Coxes and Foxes." He is in no respect extravagant in his compliments to Plato. He allows any body to tap him; compares him with Epicurus; and sets old Diogenes upon him with such weapons as he could most readily pick up in street or by-way. While we write these things in water, we think of the imperishable record he has made against all hypocrisy, cant and pretension. He has no respect for shams and humbug, though they are terms which he seldom, if ever, employs. He goes not out to fight them, like Macaulay, with an "army with banners;" nor does he cry out, like Carlyle, "Behold! how I crucify them!" But before we are aware that a blow has been struck, they are torn and riddled at our feet; we did not notice how or when; but that they are essentially "done for" we see and know. No man so tolerant of error merely, so no foe to pride, dishonesty and mere pretension is so remorseless as he. And he counts no man so much in need of salvation as he who limits the goodness of God and looks with contempt and scorn upon his "unquickened" "brother of the clay." As we propose making very liberal quotations from our author, which we are the more induced to do from the consideration that his writings are but little known in this country, we must make an end of our introductory lucubrations. We hope, if such indulgence can be granted, to present our readers with one, and perhaps two, entire dialogues. Our first extracts shall be from the "Conversation" of Lord Brooke and Sir Philip Sidney.

"Piety, warm, soft and passive as the ether round the throne of Grace, is made callous and inactive by kneeling too much; her vitality faints under rigorous and wearisome observances; a forced match between a man and his religion sours his temper and leaves a barren bed."

"Sidney. Poets are in general prone to melancholy; yet the most plaintive ditty hath imparted a fuller joy, and of longer duration to its composer, than the conquest of Persia to the Macedonian. A bottle of wine bringeth as much pleasure as the acquisition of a kingdom, and not unlike it in kind; the senses in both cases are confused and perverted. Brooke. Merciful heaven! and from the fruition of an hour's drunkenness, from

Digitized by Google

which they must awaken with heaviness, pain, and terror, men consume a whole crop of their kind at one harvest-home. Shame upon those light ones who carol at the feast of blood! and worse upon those graver ones who nail upon their escutcheon the name of great. Ambition is but avarice on stilts and masked. God sometimes sends a famine, sometimes a pestilence, and sometimes a hero for the chastisement of mankind; none of them surely for our admiration. Only some cause like unto that which is now scattering the mental fog of the Netherlands, and is preparing them for the fruits of freedom, can justify us in drawing the sword abroad."

"That life has not been spent idly which has been mainly spent in conciliating the generous affections, by such studies and pursuits as best furnish the mind for their reception. How many who have abandoned for public life the studies of philosophy and poetry, may be compared to brooks and rivers, which in the beginning of their course have assuaged our thirst, and have invited us to tranquillity by their bright resemblance of it, and which afterwards partake the nature of that vast body whereunto they run, its dreariness, its bitterness, its foam, its storms, its everlasting noise and commotion!"

We pass to the first dialogue between Southey and Porson.

"There is as great a difference between Shakspeare and Bacon as between an American forest and a London timber-yard. In the timber-yard the materials are sawed and squared and set across: in the forest we have the natural form of the tree, all its growth, all its branches, all its leaves, all the mosses that grow about it, all the birds and insects that inhabit it; now deep shadows absorbing the whole wilderness; now bright, bursting glades, with exuberant grass and flowers and fruitage; now untroubled skies, now terrific thunderstorms; everywhere multiformity, everywhere immensity." . . . . .

"Great men will always pay deference to greater: little men will not: because the little are fractious; and the weaker they are the more obstinate and crooked." . . . . .

"Clear writers, like clear fountains, do not seem as deep as they are; the turbid look the most profound."

In another place:

"What a blessing are metaphysics to our generation! A poet or other who can make nothing clear, can stir up enough sediment to render the bottom of a basin as invisible as the deepest

Digitized by Google

gulf in the Atlantic. The shallowest pond, if turbid, has depth enough for a goose to hide its head in."

The second conversation shall yield us the following:

"PORSON. There is that soft and quiet and genial humor about you, which raises my spirits and tranquillizes my infirmity. Why (I wonder) have we not always been friends?

SOUTHEY. Alas, my good Mr. Professor! how often have the worthiest men asked the same question, not indeed of each other, but of their own hearts, when age and sickness have worn down their asperities, when rivalships have grown languid, animosities tame, inert and inexcitable, and when they have become aware of approaching more nearly the supreme perennial fountain of benevolence and truth?" . . . . .

"There are certain men who are driven by necessity to exhibit some sore absurdity; it is their only chance of obtaining a night's lodging in the memory." . . . . .

Cromwell and Walter Noble. "NOBLE. There is an awfulness in symmetry which chastens even the wildest, and there is a terror in distortion at which they strike and fly."

Chesterfield and Chatham. "CHESTERFIELD. I do not admire Mr. Locke. CHATHAM. Nor I; he is too simply grand for admiration. I contemplate and revere him." . . . . .

"There is as much difference between Plato and Bacon as there is between a pliant, luxuriant twig, waving backward and forward on the summit of a tree, and a sound, stiff, well-seasoned walking-stick, with a ferule that sticks as far as is needful into the ground and makes every step secure." . . . . .

"The tomb is the pedestal of greatness. I make a distinction between God's great and the king's great." . . . . .

There is a characteristic dialogue between Henry VIII, the pious founder of the English Church, and the kind-hearted Anne Boleyn.

"ANNE. O my dear husband! it must be a naughty thing indeed that makes Him angry beyond remission. Did you ever try how pleasant it is to forgive any one? There is nothing else wherein we can resemble God perfectly and easily. HENRY. Resemble God perfectly and easily! Do vile creatures talk thus of the Creator? ANNE. No, Henry, when his creatures talk thus of him, they are no longer vile creatures! When they know that he is good they love him, and when they love him they are good themselves. O Henry! my husband and king! the judgements of our Heavenly Father are righteous: on this surely we must think alike."

Digitized by Google

Here, in Landor's best manner, is enunciated one of the greatest of all truths; which men, and especially divines, would do well to heed. It is one of the solid butments of Christianity. No superstructure of religion or morality can rest securely upon any other foundation. Strangest of all things strange, that men will not see it, and preach it in their sermons and in their lives. "A happy bit hame this auld world would be" were it but recognized as it should be among men. We must believe in God's infinite goodness, that his judgements are righteous; till then we cannot love him, the heart cannot go out towards him in pure and unchecked affection. And how can we believe this, how can we love him, with the dogma that he will "cast off forever" and be "always wroth"? No, no, there can be no perfect spiritual growth apart from this foundation; the world can never be evangelized so long as it remains a stranger to this great truth. Good men of all sects cling to it in their hearts. How often are men better than their creeds! Why should it not be taught? Has the world profited so much from the doctrines of fear and force that it may justly hesitate to try the power of love and gentleness? Have not liberal opinions gone hand-in-hand with human progress, kept company with all advancement? And shall the lesson be unheeded? The superstitions of the past hold by the skirts thousands who dare hope for the ultimate extinction of sin and misery; they hesitate; they fear to proclaim a doctrine, which, although good to cherish in their own hearts, may be unprofitable to others; overlooking the fact that it is not inconsistent with, if it does not indeed involve, the idea of sure and adequate punishment for transgression; and not perceiving that it carries with it the only fear, the only apprehension, that is salutary and practically valuable.

Henry has broken to Anne his purpose to take her life; yet, he is not satisfied; he seems to take a fiendish pleasure in teasing her. He says:

"Thou appearest hale and resolute, and (they tell me) smirkest and smilest to every body. ANNE. The withered leaf catches the sun sometimes, little as it can profit by it; and I have heard stories of the breeze in other climates, that sets in when daylight is about to close, and how constant it is, and how refreshing.

Digitized by Google

My heart indeed is now sustained strangely; it became the more sensibly so from that time forward when power and grandeur and all things terrestrial were sunk from sight. Every act of kindness from those about me gives me satisfaction and pleasure such as I did not feel formerly. I was worse before God chastened me; yet I was never an ingrate. What pains have I taken to find out the village-girls who placed their posies in my chamber ere I arose in the morning! how gladly would I have recompensed the forester who lit up a brake on my birth-night, which else had warmed him half the winter! But those times are past: I was not queen of England."

One of the best conversations is between Andrew Marvel and Bishop Parker. We are almost tempted to copy it entire. We must be content with the following extracts.

"Between the titled man of ancient and the titled man of recent, (family) the difference if any is in favor of the last. Suppose them both raised for merit (here indeed we do come to theory!), the benefits that society has received from him are nearer us. It is probable that many in the poor and abject are of very ancient families, and particularly in our country where the contests of the York and Lancaster broke down, in many places, the high and powerful. Some of us may look back six or seven centuries, and find a stout ruffian at the beginning: but the great ancestor of the pauper, who must be somewhere, may stand, perhaps, far beyond." . . . . .

"With the greatest rulers upon earth, head and crown drop together, and are overlooked. It is true we read of them in history; but we also read in history of crocodiles and hyænas. With great writers, whether in poetry or prose, what falls away is scarcely more or other than a vesture. The features of the man are imprinted on his works; and more lamps burn over them, and more religiously, than are lighted in temples or churches. Milton and men like him bring their own incense, kindle it with their own fire, and leave it unconsumed and unconsumable; and their music, by day and by night, swells along a vault commensurate with the vault of heaven." . . . . .

"You cannot blot or burn out an ancient name: you cannot annihilate past services: you cannot subtract one single hour from eternity, nor wither one leaf on his brow who hath entered into it." . . . . .

"The fool who ventures to detract from Milton's genius in the night which now appears to close on him, will, when the dawn

Digitized by Google

has opened on his dull ferocity, be ready to bite off a limb, if he might thereby limp away from the trap he has prowled into."

"A gardener may write *sweet-lupin* on the cover of rape-seed, but the cover will never turn rape-seed into sweet-lupin. Something more than a couple of beasts couchant or rampant, blue or blazing, or than a brace of birds with a claw on a red curtain, is requisite to raise an earl or a marquis up to me, although lion-king-at-arms and garter-king-at-arms, equip them with all their harness." . . . . .

"We think to thrive by surrendering our capacities; but we can no more live with breathing the breath of other men than we can by not breathing our own. Compliancy will serve us poorly and ineffectually. Men, like columns, are only strong while they are upright." . . . . .

"A gilded organ-pipe, puffed from below for those above to play." . . . . . "As the needle turns away from the rising sun, from the meridian, from the occidental, from regions of fragrancy and gold and gems, and moves with unerring impulse to the frosts and deserts of the north, so Milton and some few others in politics, philosophy, and religion, walk through the busy multitude, wave aside the importunate trader, and, after a momentary oscillation from external agency, are found in the twilight and in the storm, pointing with certain index to the pole-star of immutable truth." . . . . .

"Low places are foggy first; days of sadness wet the people to the skin; they hang loosely for sometime upon the ermine, but at last they penetrate it, and cause it to be thrown off. I do not like to hear a man cry out with pain; but I would rather hear one than twenty. Sorrow is the growth of all seasons; we had much however to relieve it. Never did our England, since she first emerged from the ocean, rise so high above surrounding nations. The rivalry of Holland, the pride of Spain, the insolence of France, were thrust back by one finger each: yet those countries were more powerful then than they had ever been. The sword of Cromwell was preceded by the mace of Milton; by that mace which, when Oliver had rendered his account, opened to our contemplation the garden-gate of Paradise. And there were some around not unworthy to enter with him. In the compass of sixteen centuries you will not number on the whole earth so many wise and admirable men as you could have found united in that single day, when England showed her true magnitude, and solved the question, Which is most, one or a million? There were giants in those days; but giants who feared God, and not who fought against him."

"My lord! Heaven is not to be won by short hard work at

Digitized by Google

the last, as some of us take a degree at the university, after much irregularity and negligence. I prefer a steady pace from the outset to the end, coming in cool and dismounting quietly. Instead of which, I have known many old play-fellows of the devil spring up suddenly from their beds and strike at him treacherously; while he, without a cuff, laughed and made grimaces in the corner of the room."

We had marked, for quotation, several passages in the "conversations" between "Galileo, Milton, and a Dominican," and between "the Emperor of China and Tsing-ti." (Was this last suggested by the colloquy between Captain Lemuel Gulliver and the Emperor of Brobdignag?) But we must forbear.

That the great and good Sir Samuel Romilly was the broad, catholic, practical man that appears before us in the following dialogue, we have no manner of doubt. But we *do* question that Mr. Wilberforce was quite so narrow, vain and slavish as Mr. Landor would make him. We do no injustice to this excellent and conscientious man when we say he was wanting in breadth, liberality, boldness; nor do we doubt that many most religious men, many wise and sincere reformers, of his day, saw in the philanthropist of-one-idea, in the defender of the Church, and friend of Pitt, some of the features to which Mr. Landor has given the touches of caricature. The truth is, Mr. L. meant to express some opinions respecting war, the Church of England, the bishops, Mr. Pitt, and King George, and disliking Mr. Wilberforce, assigned to him the unprosperous side in the conference. Of Romilly, lord Brougham has well said, "The friend of public virtue, and the advocate of human improvement, will mourn still more sorrowfully over his urn than the admirers of genius, or those who are dazzled by political triumphs. For no one could know Romilly, and doubt that, as he only valued his own success and his own powers, in the belief that they might conduce to the good of mankind, so each augmentation of his authority, each step of his progress, must have been attended with some triumph in the cause of humanity and justice. True, he would, at length, in the course of nature, have ceased to live; but then the bigot would have ceased to persecute—the despot to vex—the desolate poor to suffer—the slave to groan and trem-

Digitized by Google

ble—the ignorant to commit crimes—and the ill-contrived law to engender criminality."

We introduce

"*Romilly and Wilberforce.* ROMILLY. Indeed, Sir, I cannot but suspect that the agitation of this question on the abolition of the slave-trade, is countenanced by Mr. Pitt chiefly to divert the attention of the people from crying grievances nearer home. Our paupers are increasing daily, both in number and in wretchedness: our work-houses, our hospitals, and our jails are crowded and overflowing; our manufactories are almost as stifling as slave-ships and more immoral; apprentices, milliners, dressmakers, work throughout the greater part of the night, and, at last, disabled by toil, take the sorrowful refuge of the street. After so many have coldly repeated that vice leads to misery, is there no generous man who will proclaim aloud that misery leads to vice? We all see it every day: we warn the wretched too late: we are afraid of warning the affluent too soon: we are prodigal of reproaches that make the crushed heart bleed afresh: we think it indecorous to approach the obdurate one, and unsafe to touch it—barbarous and dastardly as we are. WILBERFORCE. Postponing all these considerations, not immediately applicable to the subject on which, Mr. Romilly, I have taken the liberty to knock at your door, I must assure you that my friend, Mr. Pitt, is not only the most unbending and unchanging, but also the most sincere man living. ROMILLY. It is happy when we can think so of any, especially of one in power. WILBERFORCE. Do you doubt it? ROMILLY. I never oppose, without reluctance, opinion to sentiment; or, when I can help it, a bad opinion to a good one. WILBERFORCE. O! if you knew him as I do! ROMILLY. The thing is impossible. WILBERFORCE. Why so? I should be proud to introduce you. ROMILLY. The pride would rest entirely apart from me. It may be that coarse metals are less flexible than finer; certain it is that they do not well cohere. WILBERFORCE. But on this occasion you invariably vote together. ROMILLY. In the House of Commons. WILBERFORCE. It is there we must draw up our forces. ROMILLY. Do you never doubt, however slightly, and only on one occasion, the fidelity of your leader? WILBERFORCE. Leader! Mr. Romilly! leader! Humble as I am, the humblest indeed of that august assembly, on this question, on this alone perhaps, yes, certainly on this alone, I am acknowledged, universally acknowledged, I know too well how unworthily, yet I do know, and God has given me strength and grace to declare it before men, that I, the weakest of his creatures, *there* am leader. It is I, a band of withy, who bind giants:

Digitized by Google

it it I who keep together, on this ground, the two rival parties: it is I, a potter's vessel, who hold out across the Atlantic the cup of freedom and of fellowship. ROMILLY. Certainly you have seconded with admirable zeal the indefatigable Clarkson. Those who run with spirit and celerity have no breath for words: the whole is expended in action. WILBERFORCE. Just so with me. However, I can spare a speech of a few hours every session, in expounding the vexations and evils of slavery, and in showing how opposite it is to Christianity. ROMILLY. I am almost a believer in that doctrine. WILBERFORCE. Almost? ROMILLY. I should be entirely, if many of the most orthodox men in both Houses, including a great part of the bishops, had been assenters. WILBERFORCE. Are they not? ROMILLY. Apparently no. Otherwise they would never be absent when the question is discussed, nor would they abstain from a petition to the Crown, that a practice so dangerous to salvation, so certain to bring down a curse on the country, be, with all expedient speed, abolished. WILBERFORCE. It is unnecessary for me to defend the conduct of my Right Reverend friends; men of such piety as no other country hath exhibited; but, permit me to remark, Mr. Romilly, that you yourself betray a lukewarmness in the cause, when you talk of expedient speed. Expedient indeed! Gracious Jesu! Ought such a crime to be tolerated for one hour? Are there no lightnings in heaven. ROMILLY. Probably there are; there were last summer. But I would rather see them purifying the air than scorching the earth before me. My good Mr. Wilberforce! abstain, I beseech you, from a species of eloquence in which Mr. Sheridan and Mr. Pitt excel you, especially when it is late in the evening: at that season such men are usually the most pious. The lightnings of heaven fall as frequently on granaries as on slave-ships. It is better at all times to abstain from expostulating with God; and more especially on the righteousness of his judgements and the delay of his vengeance. WILBERFORCE. Mr. Romilly! Mr. Romilly! the royal psalmist— ROMILLY. Was too often like other royal personages, and, with much power of doing evil, was desirous of much more. Whenever we are conscious of such propensities, it would be wiser and more religious to implore of God to pardon than to promote them. WILBERFORCE. We must bow to authority in all things. ROMILLY. So we hear: but we may be so much in the habit of bowing as at last to be unable to stand upright. Before we begin at all it is useful to inquire what is authority. We are accustomed to mistake place and power for it. Now the devil, on this earth at least, possesses as much power as the Deity, and more place. Unless he did, we tell a manifest lie in every prayer and supplication. For we de-

Digitized by Google

clare that we are, and always have been, miserable sinners, and that there is no truth in us. WILBERFORCE. Ah, my dear sir! you are no theologian, I see. Some of us, by the blessing of God, are under grace; and once under grace we are safe. But it is not on this business I visit you. Here we may differ; but on the Abolition we think alike. ROMILLY. I am not quite sure of that. WILBERFORCE. Indeed! Then, pray, my dear sir, correct your judgement. ROMILLY. I have been doing it, to the best of my ability, all my life. WILBERFORCE. If you had only clung to the Cross, you would have been sure and steadfast from your very childhood. ROMILLY. Alas! I see but one cross remaining upon earth, and it is that of the unrepentant thief. What thousands of the most venomous wasps and hornets swarm about it and fight for its putrescencies. The blessed one was pulled down long ago, indeed soon after its erection, in the scuffle of those who would sell the splinters. Great fortunes are daily made by it, and it maintains as many clerks and treasurers as the South-sea. The money-changers in the temple of old did at least give change; ours beg the money and say *call to-morrow.* WILBERFORCE. Unholy as the gains may be we must not meddle with vested rights and ancient institutions. ROMILLY. Then, worthy Mr. Wilberforce, let slavery continue; for certainly no institution is more ancient. In this also am I to correct my judgement? WILBERFORCE. The fact is too true. You were erroneous there only when you differed from me on that subject, which I had examined attentively and minutely. ROMILLY. Namely, the Abolition. WILBERFORCE. Exactly so. ROMILLY. The clearers of the ground in the forests of America clear first the places round about the homestead. On this principle I would begin to emancipate and enlighten the suffering laborers in my own vicinity. Look at the draught-horses now passing under the window. The first quarter of their lives was given to their growth: plentiful food came before painful service. They are ignorant of our vices, insensible of our affections: ease is all in all to them; and while they want it most, and while it is most profitable or promissory to the master, they enjoy it. WILBERFORCE. We then put blinkers before their eyes, that nothing may make them swerve on the road. Here is another act of humanity. ROMILLY. If you attempt to put blinkers before the intellectual eye, you only increase its obliquity. Give as much clear-sightedness, give reasonable leisure, or you never will conciliate affection to your institutions. Inflict on men the labor and privations of brutes, and you impress on them the brutal character; render them rationally happy and they are already on the highway to heaven. No man rationally happy will barter the pos-

Digitized by Google

session he enjoys for the most brilliant theory; but the unhappy will dream of daggers until he clutches them. If your friend Mr. Pitt wishes to retard the revolutionary movement, he will not attempt to put the fetter on the white man while you are taking it off the black; he will not bring back the flogged soldiery to confront an enthusiastical one; he will not display to the vigorous sons of starving yeomen the sight of twenty farm-houses rising up from the ruins of one *château.* Peace is easier to retain than to recall. WILBERFORCE. Well, Mr. Romilly! we are departing a little from the object of my visit: and if we continue to digress, I am afraid you may not be so entirely at leisure to hear me repeat the speech I have prepared on the Abolition. Your room appears to be well adapted to my voice. ROMILLY. Already I have had the benefit of your observations the three last sessions. WILBERFORCE. You will hear me again, I confidently hope, with the same pleasure in a very crowded house. ROMILLY. You represent a Riding in the county of York. WILBERFORCE. I have that honor. ROMILLY. To represent a county is not in itself an honor; but it offers opportunities of earning many. Inform your constituents that the slavery in the West Indies is less cruel and pernicious than the slavery in their own parishes: that the condition of the black is better, on the whole, than the condition of the pauper in England, and that his children are incomparably more comfortable and happy. WILBERFORCE. Lord of mercy! do I hear this from a philanthropist? ROMILLY. I venture to assert, you do, however deficient I may be in the means of showing it. You might, in any session of Parliament, obtain a majority of votes in favor of a bill to diminish the hours of a child's labor in factories. Every country gentleman, every peer, would vote that none under his eighth year should be incarcerated in these pest-houses. WILBERFORCE. O Sir! is such a word applicable? ROMILLY. Precisely: although a pest-house is usually the appellation of that building which excludes the malady, and receives the endangered. From eight years to twelve I would prohibit a longer daily work than of six hours, with two hours between each three, for food and exercise. After the twelfth year the sexes should not be confounded. WILBERFORCE. The first regulation would create much discontent among our wealthiest supporters; and even the parents would object to them. ROMILLY. Two signal and sorrowful truths! There are also two additional. They who feel the least for others feel the most for themselves: and the parents who waste away their own strength in gin-shops are ready to waste their children's in factories. If our inconsiderate war and our prodigal expenditure permitted the exercise of policy, we should bethink ourselves that manly hearts

Digitized by Google

and sound bodies are the support of states, not creaking looms nor over-pressed cotton-bags in human shape: we have no right to break down the sinews of the rising generation: we have no right to devote the children of the poor either to Belial or to Moloch. I do care about the blacks; I do care greatly and anxiously about them; but I would rather that slavery should exist for seven centuries longer in the West Indies, than for seven years longer in Lancashire and Yorkshire. If there be any sincerity in the heart of Mr. Pitt, why does he not order his dependents in both Houses (and nearly all are his dependents in both alike) to vote for your motion? WILBERFORCE. He wishes us well; but he is aware that a compensation must be made to the masters of the slaves; and he has not money for it. ROMILLY. Whose fault is that? He always has found money enough for extending the miseries of other nations and the corruptions of his own. By his extravagance and the excess of taxation, he is leading to that catastrophe which he avowed it was his object to prevent. WILBERFORCE. God forbid! ROMILLY. God has forbidden; but he does not mind that. . . . . WILBERFORCE. Impossible. Mr. Pitt says that peace is never to be signed without indemnity for the past and security for the future. These are his very words. ROMILLY. Not as a politician, but as an arithmetician, he knew when he uttered these words that they never could be accomplished. War is alike the parent and child of evil. It would surpass your ingenuity or Mr. Pitts', to discover any whatsoever which does not arise from war, or follow war, or romp and revel in the midst of war. It begins in pride and malice, it continues in cruelty and rapine, it terminates in poverty and oppression. Our bishops who pray for success in it, are much bolder men than our soldiers who engage in it bayonet to bayonet. For the soldier fights only against man, and under the command of man; the bishop fights against the command of God, and against God himself. Every hand lifted up in prayer for homicide, strikes him in the face. . . . . ROMILLY. Unless we respect ourselves, our respect for superiors is prone to servility. No man can be thrown by another from such a height as he can throw himself from. I never have observed that a tendency toward the powerful was a sufficient check to spiritual pride: and extremely few have I known, or heard of, who, tossing up their nostrils into the air and giving tongue that they have hit upon the trail to heaven, could distinguish humility from baseness. Mostly they dirty those they fawn on, and get kicked before they get fed. WILBERFORCE. Christianity makes allowances for human infirmity. ROMILLY. Christianity, as now practised by the highest of its professors, makes more infirmities than

Digitized by Google

allowances. Can we believe in *their* belief who wallow in wealth and war? in theirs who vote subsidies for slaughter? who speed the slave-ship with their prayers? who bind and lacerate and stifle the helpless wretches they call men and brethren? WILBERFORCE. Parliamentary steps must be taken before you can expect to mitigate the causes of war and slavery. ROMILLY. By whom first should the steps be taken? Persuade the bishops, if you can, to raise their voices for the double abolition. Let them at least unite and join you in that which, apparently, you have most at heart. In order to effect it gradually, I am ready to subscribe my name to any society, of which the main object shall be the conversion of our spiritual lords to Christianity. The waters of Jordan, which were formerly used for bleaching, serve at present no other purpose than the setting of scarlet and purple. WILBERFORCE. There is danger in touching the altar. We may overturn the table and bruise the chalice in attempting any restoration of the structure. ROMILLY. Christianity is a plant which grows well from seeds, but ill from cuttings: they who have grafted it on a wilding have sometimes succeeded; never they who (as we have) innoculated on one cracked in the stem and oozing over with foul luxuriance. . . . . ROMILLY: No indeed: I never sunned myself on the trim and short grass bordered by the paper pinks and powdered ranunculuses of Voltaire. His pertness is amusing: but I thought it pleasanter to bathe in the deep wisdom of wit running up to its banks through the romantic scenery of Cervantes. WILBERFORCE. Little better than infidelity. ROMILLY. But not as infidelity generally is sterile and flimsy. Christians themselves are all infidels in the sight of some other Christians; and they who come nearest to them are the most obnoxious. Strange interpolation of "Love your neighbor!" If there are grades of belief, there must also be grades of unbelief. The worst of unbelief is that which regrets the goodness of our heavenly Father, and from which there springs in us a desire of breaking what we cannot bend, and of twisting wire after wire and tying knot after knot in his scourge. . . . . WILBERFORCE. My opinion is, that religion should be mixed up in all our institutions, and that it should not only be a part, but the main part of the state. ROMILLY. I must declare to you my conviction that even the best government and the best religion should be kept apart in their ministries. In building a house, brick and lime are ingredients. Let the brick be imbedded in the lime and reduced to mortar; but if you mix it in the composition of the brick, it swells and cracks and falls to pieces in the kiln. WILBERFORCE. That is no argument. ROMILLY. Arguments cease to be arguments the moment they come home. But this, I

Digitized by Google

acknowledge, is only an illustration. To detain you no longer, Mr. Wilberforce, I give you my promise I will attend the debate, and vote with you. Neither of us can live long enough to see the Africans secure from bondage, or from the violence of tribe against tribe, and from the myriads of other calamities that precede it. Europe is semi-barbarous at the present hour; and, even among the more civilized, one state is as suspicious of another as one black is of another in the belligerents of Senegal and Gambia. For many years to come, no nation will unite with us in any work or project for the furtherance of our mutual well-being: little then can we expect that Honor, now totally lost sight of on the Continent, will be recognized in a character so novel as the Knight-errant of humanity. One more remark at parting; the only one by which in this business I can hope to serve you materially. Permit me to advise you, Mr. Wilberforce, to display as small a portion of historical research as you possibly can, consistently with your eloquence and enthusiasm. WILBERFORCE. Why so, Mr. Romilly? ROMILLY. Because it may counteract your benevolent intentions. WILBERFORCE. Nothing shall counteract them. ROMILLY. Are you aware to which of our sovereigns we must attribute the deadly curse of African slavery, inasmuch as our country is concerned in it? WILBERFORCE. Certainly to none of our justly revered kings can so horrible a crime be imputed, although the royal power, according to the limitations of our constitution, may have been insufficient to repress it effectively. ROMILLY. Queen Elizabeth equipped two vessels for her own sole profit, in which two vessels, escorted by the fleet under the command of Hawkins, were the first unhappy blacks inveigled from their shores by Englishmen, and doomed to end their lives in servitude. Elizabeth was avaricious and cruel; but a small segment of her heart had a brief sunshine on it, darting obliquely. We are under a king notoriously more avaricious: one who passes without a shudder the gibbets his own sign-manual has garnished; one who sees on the field of the most disastrous battles, battles in which he ordered his people to fight his people, nothing else to be regretted than the losses of horses and saddles, of haversacks and jackets. If this insensate and insatiable man ever hears that Queen Elizabeth was a slave-dealer, he will assert the inalienable rights of the Crown, and swamp your motion."

We have copied so largely from this dialogue that we have no room for the observations we would gladly make. We do not regard it as among the best in these volumes. It has some of the peculiar faults of our author, and for

Digitized by Google

this reason, among others, we thought it not amiss to make the liberal drafts upon it we have ventured. We shall make no apology—though we might here and there enter a *caveat*—for giving, without abridgement, the admirable 'conversation' with which we close. It is between

"*Melancthon and Calvin.* CALVIN. Are you sure, O Melancthon! that you yourself are among the elect? MELANCTHON. My dear brother! so please it God, I would rather be among the many. CALVIN. Of the damned? MELANCTHON. Alas! no. But I am inclined to believe that the many will be saved and will be happy, since Christ came into the world for the redemption of sinners. CALVIN. Hath not our Saviour said explicitly, that many are called, but few chosen? MELANCTHON. Our Saviour? hath he said it? CALVIN. *Hath* he forsooth! Where is your New Testament? MELANCTHON. In my heart. CALVIN. Without this page however. MELANCTHON. When we are wiser and more docile, that is, when we are above the jars and turmoils and disputations of the world, our Saviour will vouchsafe to interpret what, through the fumes of our intemperate vanity, is now indistinct or dark. He will plead for us before no inflexible judge. He came to remit the sins of man; not the sins of a few, but of many; not the sins of many, but of all. CALVIN. What! of the benighted heathen too? of the pagan? of the idolater? MELANCTHON. I hope so; but I dare not say it. CALVIN. You would even include the negligent, the indifferent, the sceptic, the unbeliever. MELANCTHON. Pitying them for a want of happiness in a want of faith. They are my brethren: they are God's children. He will pardon the presumption of my wishes for their welfare; my sorrow that they have fallen, some through their blindness, others through their deafness, others through their terror, others through their anger peradventure at the loud denunciations of unforgiving man. If I would forgive a brother, may not he, who is immeasurably better and more merciful, have pity on a child? He came on earth to take our nature upon him? will he punish, will he reprehend us, for an attempt to take as much as may be of his upon ourselves? CALVIN. There is no bearing any such fallacies. MELANCTHON. Is it harder to bear these fallacies (as they appear to you, and perhaps are, for we all are fallible, and many even of our best thoughts are fallacies,) is it harder, O my friend, to bear these, than to believe in the eternal punishment of the erroneous? CALVIN. *Erroneous* indeed! Have they not the Book of Life, now at last laid open before them, for their guidance? MELANCTHON. No, indeed; they have only two or three places, dog-eared and bedaubed, which they are

Digitized by Google

commanded to look into and study. These are so uninviting, that many close again the volume of salvation, clasp it tight, and throw it back in our faces. I would rather show a man green fields than gibbets; and if I called him to enter the service of a plenteous house and powerful master, he may not be rendered the more willing to enter it by my pointing out to him the stocks in the gate-way, and telling him that nine-tenths of the household, however orderly, must occupy that position. The book of *good news* under your interpretation, tells people not only that they may go and be damned, but that unless they are lucky, they must inevitably. Again it informs another set of inquirers that if once they have been under what they feel to be the influence of grace, they never can relapse. All must go well who have once gone well; and a name once written in the list of favorites can never be erased. CALVIN. This is certain. MELANCTHON. Let us hope then, and in holy confidence let us believe, that the book is large and voluminous; that it begins at an early date of man's existence; and that amid the agitation of inquiry, it comprehends the humble and submissive doubter. For doubt itself, between the richest patrimony and utter destitution, is quite sufficiently painful: and surely it is a hardship to be turned over into a criminal court for having lost in a civil one. But if all who have once gone right can never go astray, how happens it that so large a part of the angels fell off from their allegiance? They were purer and wiser than we are, and had the advantage of seeing God face to face. They were the ministers of his power; they knew its extent: yet they defied it. If we err, it is in relying too confidently on his mercies; not in questioning his omnipotence. If our hopes forsake us, if the bonds of sin bruise and corrode us, so that we cannot walk upright, there is, in the midst of these calamities, no proof that we are utterly lost. Danger far greater is there in the presumption of an especial favor, which men incomparably better than ourselves can never have deserved. Let us pray, O Calvin, that we may hereafter be happier than our contentions and animosities will permit us to be at present; and that our opponents, whether now in the right or in the wrong, may come at last where all error ceases. CALVIN. I am uncertain whether such a wish is rational: and I doubt more whether it is religious. God hath willed them to walk in their blindness. To hope against it seems like repining at his unalterable decree; a weak indulgence in an unpermitted desire; an unholy entreaty of the heart that He will forego his vengeance, and abrogate the law that was from the beginning. Of one thing I am certain: we must lop off the unsound. MELANCTHON. What a curse hath metaphor been to religion! It is the wedge that holds asunder

Digitized by Google

the two great portions of the Christian world. We hear of nothing so commonly as fire and sword. And here indeed what was metaphor is converted into substance and applied to practice. The unsoundness of doctrine is not cut off nor cauterized; the professor is. The head falls on the scaffold, or fire surrounds the stake, because a doctrine is bloodless and incombustible. Fierce outrageous animals, for want of the man who has escaped them, lacerate and trample his cloak or bonnet. This although the work of brutes, is not half so brutal as the practice of theologians, seizing the man himself instead of the bonnet or cloak. CALVIN. We must leave such matters to the magistrate. MELANCTHON. Let us instruct the magistrate in his duty; this is ours. Unless we can teach humanity we may resign the charge of religion. For fifteen centuries, Christianity has been conveyed into many houses, in many cities, in many regions, but always through slender pipes; and never yet into any great reservoir in any part of the earth. Its principal ordinances have never been observed in the polity of any state whatever. Abstinence from spoliation, from oppression, from bloodshed, has never been inculcated by the chief priests of any. These two facts excite the doubts of many in regard to a divine origin and a divine protection. Wherefore it behoves us the more especially to preach forbearance. If people are tolerant one toward another in the same country, they will become tolerant in time toward those whom rivers or seas have separated from them. For surely it is strange and wonderful that nations which are near enough for hostility should never be near enough for concord. This arises from bad government; and bad government arises from a negligent choice of counsellors by the prince, usually led or terrified by a corrupt, ambitious, wealthy (and therefore unchristian) priesthood. While their wealth lay beyond the visible horizon, they tarried at the cottage, instead of pricking on for the palace. CALVIN. By the grace and help of God we will turn them back again to their quiet and wholesome resting-place, before the people lay a rough hand upon the silk. But you evaded my argument on predestination. MELANCTHON. Our blessed Lord himself, in his last hours, ventured to express a wish before his heavenly Father, that the bitter cup might pass away from him. I humbly dare to implore that a cup much bitterer may be removed from the great body of mankind; a cup containing the poison of eternal punishment, where agony succeeds to agony, but never death. CALVIN. I come armed with the Gospel. MELANCTHON. Tremendous weapon! as we have seen it through many ages, if man wields it against man; but like the fabled spear of old mythology, endued with the faculty of healing the saddest wound its most violent wielder can

Digitized by Google

inflict. Obscured and rusting with the blood upon it, let us hasten to take it up again, and apply it, as best we may, to its appointed uses. The life of our Saviour is the simplest exposition of his words. Strife is what he both discountenanced and forbade. We ourselves are right-minded, each of us all: and others are right-minded, in proportion as they agree with us, chiefly in matters which we insist are well worthy of our adherence, but which whosoever refuses to embrace displays a factious and unchristian spirit. These are for the most part matters which neither they nor we understand, and which if we did understand them, would little profit us. The weak will be supported by the strong if they can; if they cannot, they are ready to be supported even by the weaker, and cry out against the strong as arrogant or negligent, or deaf or blind; at last even their strength is questioned, and the more if while there is fury all around them, they are quiet. I remember no discussion on religion in which religion was not a sufferer by it, if mutual forbearance, and belief in another's good motives and intentions, are (as I must always think they are) its proper and necessary appurtenances. CALVIN. Would you never make inquiries? MELANCTHON. Yes; and as deep as possible; but into my own heart; for that belongs to me; and God hath entrusted it most especially to my own superintendence. CALVIN. We must also keep others from going astray, by showing them the right road, and, if they are obstinate in resistance, then by coercing and chastising them through the magistrate. MELANCTHON. It is sorrowful to dream that we are scourges in God's hand, and that he appoints for us no better work than lacerating one another. I am no enemy to inquiry, where I see abuses, and where I suspect falsehood. The Romanists, our great oppressors, think it presumptuous to search into things abstruse; and let us do them the justice to acknowledge that, if it is a fault, it is one which they never commit. But surely we are kept sufficiently in the dark from the infirmity of our nature: no need to creep into a corner and put our hands before our eyes. To throw away or turn aside from God's best gifts is verily a curious sign of obedience and submission. He not only hath given us a garden to walk in, but he hath planted it also for us, and he wills us to know the nature and properties of every thing that grows up within it. Unless we look into them, and handle them, and register them, how shall we discover this to be salutary, that to be poisonous; this annual, that perennial? CALVIN. Here we coincide; and I am pleased to find in you less apathy than I expected. It becomes us, moreover, to denounce God's vengeance on a sinful world. MELANCTHON. Is it not better and pleasanter to show the wanderer by what course of life it may be avoided?

Digitized by Google

is it not better and pleasanter to enlarge on God's promises of salvation, than to insist on his denunciations of wrath? is it not better and pleasanter to lead the wretched up to his mercy-seat, than to hurl them by thousands under his fiery chariot? CALVIN. We have no option. By our heavenly Father many are called, but few are chosen. MELANCTHON. There is scarcely a text in the Holy Scriptures to which there is not an opposite text, written in characters equally large and legible; and there has usually been a sword laid upon each. Even the weakest disputant is made so conceited by what he calls religion, as to think himself wiser than the wisest who thinks differently from him; and he becomes so ferocious by what he calls holding it fast, that he appears to me as if he held it fast much in the same manner as a terrier holds a rat, and you have about as much trouble in getting it from between his incisors. When at last it does come out, it is mangled, distorted and extinct. CALVIN. M. Melancthon! You have taken a very perverse view of the subject. Such language as yours would extinguish that zeal which is to enlighten the nations, and to consume the tares by which they are overrun. MELANCTHON. The tares and the corn are so intermingled throughout the wide plain which our God hath given us to cultivate, that I would rather turn the patient and humble into it to weed it carefully, than a thresher who would thresh wheat and tare together before the grain is ripened, or who would carry fire into the furrows when it is. CALVIN. Yet even the most gentle, and of the gentler sex, are inflamed with a holy zeal in the propagation of the faith. MELANCTHON. I do not censure them for their earnestness in maintaining truth. We not only owe our birth to them but also the better part of our education; and if we were not divided after their first lesson, we should continue to live in a widening circle of brothers and sisters all our lives. After our infancy and removal from home, the use of the rod is the principal thing we learn of our alien preceptors, and, catching their dictatorial language, we soon begin to exercise their instrument of enforcing it, and swing it right and left, even after we are paralysed by age, and until death's hand strikes it out of ours. I am sorry you have cited the gentler part of the creation to appear before you, obliged as I am to bear witness, that I myself have known a a few specimens of the fair sex become a shade less fair, among the perplexities of religion. Indeed I am credibly informed that certain of them have lost their patience, running up and down in the dust where many roads diverge. This surely is not walking humbly with their God, nor walking with him at all; for those who walk with him are always readier to hear *His* voice than their own, and to admit that it is more persuasive. But at last

Digitized by Google

the zealot is so infatuated, by the serious mockeries he imitates and repeats, that he really takes his own voice for God's. Is it not wonderful that the words of eternal life should have hitherto produced only eternal litigation; and that, in our progress heavenward, we should think it expedient to plant unthrifty thorns over bitter wells of blood in the wilderness we leave behind us? CALVIN. It appears to me that you are inclined to tolerate even the rank idolatry of our persecutors. Shame! shame! MELANCTHON. Greater shame if I tolerated it within my own dark heart, and waved before it the foul incense of self-love. CALVIN. I do not understand you. What I do understand is this, and deny it at your peril—I mean at the peril of your salvation—that God is a jealous God: he himself declares it. MELANCTHON. We are in the habit of considering the God of Nature as a jealous God, and idolatry as an enormous evil; an evil which is about to come back into the world, and to subdue or seduce once more our strongest and most sublime affections. Why do you lift up your eyes and hands? CALVIN. An evil *about* to come back! *about* to come! Do we not find it in high places? MELANCTHON. We do indeed, and always shall, while there are any high places upon earth. Thither will men creep and there fall prostrate. CALVIN. Against idolatry we still implore the Almighty that he will incline our hearts to keep his law. MELANCTHON. The Jewish law; the Jewish idolatry. You fear the approach of this, and do not suspect the presence of a worse. CALVIN. A worse than that which the living God hath denounced? MELANCTHON. Even so. CALVIN. Would it not offend, would it not wound to the quick, a mere human creature, to be likened to a piece of metal or stone, a calf or monkey? MELANCTHON. A mere human creature, might be angry; because his influence among his neighbors arises in a great measure from the light in which he appears to them; and this light does not emanate from himself, but may be thrown on him by any hand that is expert at mischief; beside, the likeness of such animals to him could never be suggested by reverence or esteem, nor be regarded as a type of any virtue. The mere human creature, such as for the most part human creatures are, would be angry; because he has nothing which he can oppose to ridicule but resentment. CALVIN. I am in consternation at your lukewarmness. If you treat idolators thus lightly, what hope can I entertain of discussing with you the doctrine of grace and predestination. MELANCTHON. Entertain no such hope at all. Wherever I find in the Holy Scriptures a disputable doctrine, I interpret it as judges do, in favor of the culprit: such is man: the benevolent judge is God. But in regard to idolatry, I see more criminals who are guilty

Digitized by Google

of it than you do. I go beyond the stone quarry and the pasture, beyond the graven image and the ox-stall. If we bow before the distant image of good, while there exists within our reach one solitary object of substantial sorrow, which sorrow our efforts can remove, we are guilty (I pronounce it) of idolatry: we prefer the intangible effigy to the living form. Surely we neglect the service of our Maker if we neglect his children. He left us in the chamber with them, to take care of them, and to feed them, to admonish them, and occasionally to amuse them; instead of which, after a warning not to run into the fire, we slam the door behind us in their faces, and run eagerly down stairs to dispute and quarrel with our fellows of the household who are about their business. The wickedness of idolatry does not consist in any inadequate representation of the Deity, for whether our hands or our hearts represent him, the representation is almost alike inadequate. Every man does what he hopes and believes will be most pleasing to his God; and God, in his wisdom and mercy, will not punish gratitude in its error. CALVIN, How do you know that? MELANCTHON. Because I know his loving-kindness, and experience it daily. CALVIN. If men blindly and wilfully run into error when God hath shown the right way, he will visit it on their souls. MELANCTHON. He will observe from the serenity of heaven, a serenity emanating from his presence, that there is scarcely any work of his creation on earth which hath not excited, in some people or other, a remembrance, an admiration, a symbol, of his power. The evil of idolatry is this. Rival nations have raised up rival deities: war hath been denounced in the name of Heaven: men have been murdered for the love of God: and such impiety hath darkened all the regions of the world, that the Lord of all things hath been invoked by all simultaneously as the Lord of Hosts. This is the only invocation in which men of every creed are united: an invocation to which Satan, bent on the perdition of the human race, might have listened from the fallen angels. CALVIN. We cannot hope to purify men's hearts until we lead them away from the abominations of Babylon: nor will they be led away from it until we reduce the images to dust. So long as they stand, the eye will hanker after them, and the spirit be corrupt. MELANCTHON. And long afterward, I sadly fear. We attribute to the weakest of men the appellations and powers of Deity: we fall down before them: we call the impious and cruel by the title of *gracious* and *most religious*: and, even in the house of God himself, and before his very altar, we split his Divine Majesty asunder, and offer the largest part to the most corrupt and most corrupting of his creatures. CALVIN. Not *we*, M. Melancthon. I will preach, I will exist, in no land of such

Digitized by Google

abomination. MELANCTHON. So far, well: but religion demands more. Our reformers knock off the head from Jupiter: thunderbolt and sceptre stand. The attractive, the impressive, the august, they would annihilate, leaving men nothing but their sordid fears of vindictive punishment, and their impious doubts of our Saviour's promises. CALVIN. We should teach men to retain forever the fear of God before their eyes, never to cease from the apprehension of His wrath, to be well aware that He often afflicts when He is farthest from wrath, and that such infliction is a benefit bestowed by Him. MELANCTHON. What! if only a few are to be saved when the infliction is over? CALVIN. It becometh us not to repine at the number of vessels which the supremely wise artificer forms, breaks, and casts away, or at the paucity it pleaseth him to preserve. The ways of Providence are inscrutable. MELANCTHON. Some of them are, and some of them are not; and in these it seems to be his design that we should see and adore his wisdom. We fancy that all our inflictions are sent us directly and immediately from above: sometimes we think it in piety and contrition, but oftener in moroseness and discontent. It would, however, be well if we attempted to trace the causes of them. We should probably find their origin in some region of the heart which we never had well explored, or in which we had secretly deposited our worst indulgences. *The clouds that intercept the heavens from us, come not from the heavens, but from the earth.* Why should we scribble our own devises over the Book of God, erasing the plainest words, and rendering the Holy Scriptures a worthless palimpsest? Can we not agree to show the nations of the world that the whole of Christianity is practicable, although the better parts never have been practised, no, not even by the priesthood in any single one of them. Bishops, confessors, saints, martyrs, have never denounced to king or people, nor ever have attempted to delay or mitigate, the most accursed of crimes, the crime of Cain, the crime indeed whereof Cain's was only a germ, the crime of fratricide, war, war devastating, depopulating, soul-slaughtering, heaven-defying war. Alas! the gentle call of mercy sounds feebly, and soon dies away leaving no trace on the memory: but the swelling cries of vengeance, in which we believe we imitate the voice of Heaven, run and reverberate in loud peals and multiplied echoes along the whole vault of the brain. All the man is shaken by them; and he shakes all the earth. Calvin! I beseech you, do you who guide and govern so many, do you (whatever others may) spare your brethren. Doubtful as I am of lighter texts, blown backward and forward at the opening of opposite windows,

Digitized by Google

I am convinced and certain of one grand immovable verity. It sounds strange; it sounds contradictory. CALVIN. I am curious to hear it. MELANCTHON. You shall. This is the tenet. There is nothing on earth divine beside humanity."

I. W.

ARTICLE XX.

Suggestions concerning the Teachings of Jesus Christ.

ALTHOUGH Jesus told the Roman governor that he was born and came into the world for the express purpose of bearing witness to the truth, we do not learn that he ever undertook to reduce, to what may be called a system, a work on theology. The truth which Jesus came to bear witness to, undoubtedly comprehends all which properly belongs to what we call Christianity; and all that we find in the writings of Christian theologians, which is in agreement with what he taught, may safely be received as true; and all which lacks this agreement may, with equal safety, be rejected.

With respect to the bearing of witness to the truth, and the necessity of such testimony, a few suggestions may not be out of place. In bearing witness, nothing is stated which is not true before testified. This fact leads to the consideration of a momentous subject. All the wonderful truths taught by Jesus were equally true before he was born as at the time in which he taught them to his disciples and to the multitudes who attended on his teachings. Neither his testimony nor the belief of the people made what he testified true. Jesus taught the people the true character of our Father in heaven; but that character was the same before as it was after. He taught many moral truths and divine requirements; but they were the same that were always true. These remarks are made, not because any body doubts their truth, but because many people seem to profit so little by such facts as even to marvel why certain doctrines should be preached if they

Digitized by Google

are true. This suggests the question respecting the necessity of a witness. A witness is wanted to make truth known to such as are ignorant of it. If nobody, whom the truth concerns, is ignorant of it, there is no need of testimony.

A question may arise in the reader's mind respecting the great work of man's redemption and salvation by Jesus Christ, if what he stated to Pilate embraces the whole of his divine mission. If by a careful attention to what truths Jesus bore testimony of, we shall discover that the knowledge of such truths effects the redemption and salvation of mankind, of which the Scriptures speak, a satisfactory answer to this query will be obtained.

Let us now proceed to the consideration of some of the truths to which Jesus bore testimony. The first in order is the truth of the divinity of his own mission. There seems to be a propriety in considering this truth first, because the credibility of a witness is necessary in order to give validity to his testimony. How did Jesus prove the divinity of his mission as a messenger of truth? By the works which he did in his Father's name. "These," he says, "bear witness of me." It would lead us too far from our main subject to proceed here to substantiate the truth of the miracles of Jesus. Two things, however, are worthy of notice. In the first place, it is abundantly evident that Jesus relied on his miracles to convince the people that God had sent him into the world as a teacher; and there appears no way to avoid believing in the reality of these miracles, or else of believing that he was the greatest impostor the world ever knew. Secondly, there can be no doubt that the miracles of Jesus had the effect which he intended. Nicodemus acknowledged this fact. And when John sent his disciples to Jesus to learn from him if he was the Messiah, he told them to tell John the things which they saw—referring to his miracles. In a word, there is no avoiding the conclusion that the miracles of Jesus lie at the foundation of the vast superstructure of the Christian church.

Having thus established the credibility of the witness by the truth which he himself furnished, we may proceed to the consideration of other truths to which he bore witness.

Digitized by Google

Jesus bore testimony to the truth of the Scriptures of the Old Testament. His testimony in this case is of much importance. It fixes an essential link in the chain of divine truth. And here we have a corroboration of what has been before stated,—that the truth to which the faithful witness bears testimony, is the same before the testimony is given as afterwards. If Jesus had said nothing respecting the truth of the Scriptures, it would not have rendered them less valid, in themselves, nor the less true; but we could hardly feel the same assurance in their validity without his testimony concerning them, as we do with it. In the fourth chapter of Luke we are informed that Jesus "came to Nazareth, where he had been brought up, and as his custom was, he went into the synagogue on the Sabbath day, and stood up for to read. And there was delivered unto him the book of the prophet Esaias; and when he had opened the book he found the place where it is written, The spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor; he hath sent me to heal the broken-hearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind; to set at liberty them that are bruised; to preach the acceptable year of the Lord. And he closed the book, and gave it again to the minister, and sat down. And the eyes of all them that were in the synagogue were fastened on him. And he began to say unto them, This day is this scripture fulfilled in your ears." The fact that Jesus was in the habit of reading the Scriptures in the synagogue on the Sabbath, plainly showed that he acknowledged their divine authority; and in that he applied the passage which he read, to himself, he testified that he was the subject of prophecy. In the fifth chapter of John, we are informed that Jesus said to the unbelieving Jews: "Search the Scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life; and they are they which testify of me." It would render this article too long if we should quote all the passages which relate to the witness that Jesus bore in reference to the truth of the Scriptures; yet we may not omit what he said on this subject after his resurection. See Luke xxiv: "Then said he unto them, O fools, and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken! Ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter

Digitized by Google

into his glory? And, beginning at Moses and all the prophets, he explained unto them in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself."

Taking the few passages which have been quoted as a mere sample, we find ourselves put in possession of all the prophecies concerning the Messiah, as the teachings of Jesus. But here again it is necessary to limit our references; for it would require a volume to present the reader with all which Moses and the rest of the prophets have written on this subject. In the 12th of Genesis, God promised to bless all the families of the earth in Abraham's seed; and this promise was also repeated to Isaac and Jacob. In the teachings of Jesus we find that he applies the following words of David, recorded in the 110th Psalm, to himself: "The Lord said unto my Lord, sit thou at my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy foot-stool. The Lord shall send the rod of thy strength out of Zion! rule thou in the midst of thine enemies. Thy people shall be willing in the day of thy power, in the beauty of holiness from the womb of the morning: thou hast the dew of thy youth. The Lord hath sworn and will not repent, thou art a priest forever after the order of Melchizedek." In Mat. xxii, Jesus, in conversation with the Pharisees, asked them the following question:—"What think ye of Christ? whose son is he? They say unto him, The son of David. He saith unto them, How then doth David in spirit call him Lord, saying, The Lord said unto my Lord, sit thou on my right hand, till I make thine enemies thy footstool? If David then called him Lord, how is he his son?" The words of Jesus to his disciples after his resurrection are not inappropriate here: See Luke xxiv: "And he said unto them, These are the words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, That all things must be fulfilled which were written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the psalms concerning me." To the Christian minister it must be a source of great encouragement that he has the testimony of Jesus for his authority in going to the Scriptures of the Old Testament, while preaching Christ to his hearers. In so doing, he has confidence that he follows the example of his divine master. And if he duly considers that Jesus was careful to bear witness to the truth of those Scriptures, and to their

Digitized by Google

application to himself, he cannot but feel that he dishonors the faithful and true witness by neglecting his example.

In agreement with the promise to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, that all nations should be blessed in the seed of these patriarchs, we may notice several prophecies. See Isaiah ii: "And it shall come to pass in the last days, that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills; and all nations shall flow unto it." Chap. ix: "For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given, and the government shall be upon his shoulders, and his name shall be called wonderful, counsellor, the mighty God, the everlasting Father, the prince of peace. Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom to order it, and to establish it with judgment and justice, from hence forth even forever. The zeal of the Lord of hosts will perform this." The poetic beauty of chap. xi. is really charming, as the doctrine or sentiment is important. We quote only two verses. "They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain; for the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea. And in that day there shall be a root of Jesse, which shall stand for an ensign of the people; to it shall the gentiles seek; and his rest shall be glorious." In chap. xxv, a feast unto all people is promised; death is to be swallowed up in victory; tears wiped from all faces, and the rebuke taken from the whole earth. The xlii. chap. is very explicit; but we quote only two verses: "I the Lord have called thee in righteousness, and will hold thine hand, and will keep thee, and give thee for a covenant of the people, for a light of the Gentiles; to open the blind eyes, to bring out the prisoners from the prison, and them that sit in darkness out of the prison house." It is needless to continue quotations; but let it be remembered that all such scriptures are the teachings of Jesus; he hath endorsed them, and borne witness to their truth. It is not only the privilege but the duty of the Christian preacher to search the Scriptures and learn their testimony concerning Christ.

By a careful attention to the teachings of Jesus found in his Sermon on the Mount, we are made acquainted

Digitized by Google

with the nature and spirit of his doctrine; by which we learn that the kingdom of heaven consists in purity of heart, in a right temper of mind, and in a resemblance of our Father in heaven. He told his disciples, in this sermon, that except their righteousness should exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, they should in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven. And this purity of heart, and the right temper of mind, and this resemblance to our Father in heaven, and this righteousness which exceeds that of the scribes and Pharisees, he sets forth as love to enemies. All this is clearly expressed in the following passage, which is so important, so comprehensive, as to embrace the whole of Christian doctrine. "Ye have heard that it hath been said, thou shalt love thy neighbor, and hate thine enemy; but I say unto you, love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you; that ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven; for he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust. For if ye love them which love you, what reward have ye? do not even the publicans the same? And if ye salute your brethren only, what do ye more than others? do not even publicans so? Be ye therefore, perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect." A moment's reflection on the inhuman barbarities, which we know have been practised in what has been called the Christian church, must convince us that the teachings of Jesus have been lamentably disregarded. How could a hierarchy possessing love to enemies, a heart to do good to those who hated them, and a spirit to pray for such as persecuted them, inflict all manner of tortures and the most cruel deaths on their fellow creatures?

In what is called the "beatitudes," Jesus taught his disciples the nature of the kingdom of heaven, and the moral state of the heart necessary to secure its bliss. "Blessed are the poor in spirit: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven. Blessed are they that mourn: for they shall be comforted. Blessed are the meek: for they shall inherit the earth. Blessed are they which do hunger and thirst after righteousness: for they shall be filled. Blessed are the merciful: for they shall obtain mercy. Blessed are the

Digitized by Google

pure in heart: for they shall see God. Blessed are the peace makers: for they shall be called the children of God. Blessed are they which are persecuted for righteousness' sake: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven. Blessed are ye when men shall revile you, and persecute you, and shall say all manner of evil against you falsely for my sake. Rejoice and be exceeding glad: for great is your reward in heaven; for so persecuted they the prophets which were before you."

Jesus taught his disciples, in the most simple manner, the purpose for which he chose them, and the great benefit to the world which he designed they should be. And here let it be understood, that in order that they might be of such benefit to mankind, they must continue in the spirit and the peculiar characteristics which he had just described. "Ye are the salt of the earth; but if the salt have lost its savor, wherewith shall it be salted? it is thenceforth good for nothing, but to be cast out, and be trodden under foot of men. Ye are the light of the world. A city that is set on an hill cannot be hid. Neither do men light a candle and put it under a bushel, but on a candlestick; and it giveth light unto all that are in the house. Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven."

When Jesus enjoined on his disciples the precept of loving their enemies, and enforced that precept by reference to the love and goodness of God towards the just and the unjust, the evil and the good, he taught the true character of our heavenly Father, who is without variableness or shadow of change. This love of our heavenly Father, Jesus sets forth as the moving principle pursuant to which he was sent into the world to accomplish its salvation. See John iii: "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life. For God sent not his son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through him might be saved." And here it seems proper to subjoin St. Paul's words, in Rom. v. "But God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us." Jesus not only by his words uniformly gave our heavenly Father this character, but also by all his acts and sufferings. In his

Digitized by Google

Sermon on the Mount, in order to encourage confidence in looking to God in prayer for needed favors, he exalts the divine goodness far above the parental kindness of earthly fathers. "Ask and it shall be given you; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you; for every one that asketh, receiveth; and he that seeketh, findeth; and to him that knocketh, it shall be opened. Or what man is there of you, whom if his son ask bread will give him a stone? or if he ask a fish, will give him a serpent? If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your Father which is in heaven give good things to them that ask him?" The whole Sermon on the Mount should be carefully studied, and its teachings made familiar to the mind of every Christian, especially of every Christian minister.

In the teachings of Jesus we learn the divine disposition toward sinners, and how God, in his righteous spirit, looked on them. See Mat. ix: "And it came to pass, as Jesus sat at meat in the house, behold, many publicans and sinners came and sat down with him and his disciples. And when the Pharisees saw it, they said unto his disciples, Why eateth your master with publicans and sinners? But when Jesus heard that, he said unto them, They that be whole need not a physician, but they that are sick. But go ye and learn what that meaneth, I will have mercy and not sacrifice; for I am not come to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance." On this subject the Saviour delivered the several parables recorded in Luke xv. In these parables we learn the design of divine mercy, and the nature of that salvation which sinners obtain by it. It is a salvation from sin by means of that repentance to which sinners are called by him who came for that purpose.

If we are careful rightly to understand the nature of salvation, and the means by which it is effected, we shall see that it is accomplished by bringing men to the knowledge of the truth,—to the knowledge of that truth to which Jesus bears witness. By bringing a passage already quoted from Isa. xlii., and placing with it the words of Jesus to St. Paul, recorded in Acts xxvi., we shall see that man's salvation is effected by bringing people out of moral darkness, into the light and liberty of divine truth. "I the

Digitized by Google

Lord have called thee in righteousness, and will hold thine hand, and will keep thee and give thee for a covenant of the people, for a light of the Gentiles; to open the blind eyes, to bring out the prisoners from the prison, and them that sit in darkness out of the prison-house." "And I said, who art thou, Lord? And he said, I am Jesus, whom those persecutest. But arise and stand upon thy feet; for I have appeared unto thee for this purpose, to make thee a minister and a witness, both of these things which thou hast seen, and of those things in which I will appear unto thee; delivering thee from the people, and from the Gentiles, unto whom now I send thee, to open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that they may receive forgiveness of sin, and inheritance among them which are sanctified by faith that is in me." By such testimony it appears that deliverance from sin is effected by bringing men to the knowledge of the truth. In John viii, we read: "Then said Jesus to those Jews which believed on him, if ye continue in my word, then are ye my disciples indeed; and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." In chapter xvii., Jesus said in his prayer, "As thou hast given him power over all flesh, that he should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him. And this is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent." It should be clearly understood, that the salvation spoken of in the gospel, is salvation from a condition which men are already in. Jesus came to seek and to save that which *was* lost; to save the lost from their lost condition.

Jesus taught the doctrine of a future state, and of an immortal resurrection; and to this doctrine he bore witness not only by what he said, but by his own resurrection. He spoke several times to his disciples of his own death and resurrection, and no doubt many more times than are recorded; but it is somewhat remarkable that his historians have given us so little of what he said in defence of the resurrection of men in general. In Mat. xxii., we have an account of a conversation between Jesus and the Sadducees on this momentous subject. In his reply to their question, which of seven brothers who had been the husbands of one woman, in this life, should have

Digitized by Google

her as wife in the resurrection, he said: "Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of God. For in the resurrection they neither marry nor are given in marriage; but are as the angels of God in heaven. But as touching the resurrection of the dead, have ye not read that which was spoken unto you by God, saying, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob? God is not the God of the dead, but of the living." This account in Mark and Luke slightly varies in words, but not in sense. Luke says: "Neither can they die any more; for they are equal unto the angels; and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection." It cannot be supposed that more is needed by us, of information on this all important subject, than the faithful and true witness has seen fit to give us. Jesus never, in any discourse which we find in the New Testament, carried his hearers into the immortal world, to inform them concerning the particulars of that state of existence. One thing is certain, and that is, that in all the Scriptures which relate to the future state, and man's resurrection into it, they represent the subject as something desirable, something to be hoped for.

Having extended this article beyond what was at first contemplated, and finding the subject infinitely extensive and inexhaustible, it seems necessary to come to a conclusion. The writer would express a strong desire that this feeble effort might exert some influence to induce young ministers of the word to give heed to the teachings of Jesus, and endeavor to enlighten their hearers with no other light than that which comes from him who is the *light of the world.* H. B.

Digitized by Google

Article XXI.

Ode to Memory. [1]

Sweet solacer of sadness—Memory!
  Oft when vague thought my lonely hour beguiles,
Thou lift'st thy veil and turnest back on me
  A sad, sweet face of mingled tears and smiles.

Still and serene, as shines the silent moon
  On peaceful graves, thou gazest on the past,
While round my heart, like shadows of the noon
  'Mid slumbering woods, thy gathering shades are cast.

Visions steal in, more lovely than the day
  When dewy twilight meekly round her falls,
And soft tones breathe, as flute-notes float away
  In dying murmurs down receding halls.

From the green meadows and the shady dells
  Where girlhood sung beside the glancing streams,
A long-lost sound, a far-off cadence swells,
  Filling my heart with old, forgotten dreams.

O, memory! now thou smilest through thy tears,
  And prattlest with me, tenderly and long,
Of the dear, vanished ones, whose few glad years
  Passed from the bright earth like a spirit's song.

Thou paintest me a picture—on my heart
  'Twas graven years agone and lives there yet,
Though the hot tears that from my sad eyes start
  With frequent showers its every line have wet.

A fair, sweet picture, whence blue, loving eyes
  Look into mine with soft, seraphic smile,
Whose angel faces in my dreams arise,
  And through the long day haunt me all the while.

O, memory! thus, sweet solacer of pain,
  Thou hoverest round me with thy smiles and tears,
While many a long-lost joy returns again
  And fills my heart as in the vanished years.

C. M. S.

[1] The first stanza of this poem, and first two lines of the second, are from the German.

Digitized by Google

Article XXII.

Nineveh and its Remains.

Nineveh and its Remains: with an Account of a Visit to the Chaldæan Christians of Kurdistan, and the Yezidis, or Devil-Worshippers; and an Inquiry into the Manners and Arts of the Ancient Assyrians. By Austen Henry Layard, Esq., D. C. L., &c. &c. In two volumes. New-York: George P. Putnam, &c., 1849. 8vo. [With Map & Plates.]

This work has everywhere received high commendations as an interesting book of travels, distinguished by good sense and extensive knowledge, and still more as an account of surprising discoveries among the oldest antiquities of Assyria. We subscribe to the commendations in full; but we need not repeat them. It will be of more service to pass from the merits of the author and of his book to the matter. We shall try to state briefly the historical relations of the subject, to introduce our readers to the scene of Mr. Layard's labors, to present as clear an idea as we can give of the monuments and skeleton-palaces which he has by extraordinary tact and perseverance laid open, and to show what light these remains cast on the people who founded them. In doing this, we shall not confine ourselves to the data furnished by these volumes, but shall make use also of whatever facts have come to our knowledge from other well-accredited sources.

The history and the internal condition of ancient Assyria have now lain in almost impervious obscurity, for considerably more than two thousand years. Only here and there a luminous point stands up out of the dimness that rests on the horizon. Little has been known, in modern times, except that, after many ages apparently of great power, splendor, and extensive dominion, that empire passed away from the face of the earth before the epoch at which profane history begins to be reckoned as authentic. When we seek to penetrate the darkness, by bringing all the light to bear which can be gathered from the old Greek writers, we are alternately disappointed by the scantiness of their accounts, and deeply interested by the wonderful

Digitized by Google

character of their disclosures; we are perplexed by their mutual disagreement, and embarrassed by the seeming impossibility of reconciling with the permanent land-marks of the country some of the facts on which they do agree. This, indeed, is no more than we might rationally expect of any record, howsoever true in itself, of an age and form of life that have long since disappeared. But though the particulars which those authors detail, are doubtful, there are certain general conclusions that seem to be unquestionable. While we reject the evident fables which they relate of Ninus and Semiramis, and distrust their contradictory catalogues of long-lived sovereigns during the subsequent fourteen or fifteen centuries down to about the year 800 before Christ; in a word, while, thus far, we despair of separating the mythical from the true in their reports, still we cannot well doubt so much as this: That, for a long period in that remote and hazy antiquity, Assyria was the dominant power in Central and Western Asia; the equal, and sometimes the invader, of Egypt; that she ruled, for a long time, over Mesopotamia, Babylonia, Media and Persia, where vestiges of her dominion are still found; that she extended her conquests, though perhaps at different periods, as far as India in the East and the Mediterranean in the West; and that her capital, the centre of her pomp and power, rivalled the later Babylon in extent, if not in the magnificence of its architecture. So much we may gather, with a tolerable degree of certainty, from profane history. If we then turn to the Old Testament, as the most authentic record of those primitive ages, we find only the isolated facts, that Nineveh and other Assyrian cities were built by the grandson of Noah, or perhaps by his great-grandson, the mighty Nimrod,[1] before the dispersion at Babel; that, nearly a thousand years afterwards, in the last days of Moses, the power of the Assyrians was dreaded even in the borders of

[1] Gen. x. 11. There is a question among interpreters whether the rendering of our English Version, here, is correct, or whether it should be, "*Out of that land he* [Nimrod] *went forth into Asshur, and builded Nineveh, and the city Rehoboth, and Calah,*" &c. I think the latter is preferred by the majority of the best judges. Assyria is called "the land of Nimrod" by Micah, v. 6; and it appears that tradition assigns to him some of the heaps of ruins on the Tigris.

Digitized by Google

Moab on the banks of the Jordan;[2] and that they had not ceased to be formidable to the Jews in the golden age of David.[3] Three and four centuries yet later, when their empire had probably reached its highest point of prosperity, they come out for a while into much more distinct notice in the sacred writings. Thus, the prophets, from Jonah to Zephaniah, frequently denounce the judgements of God on that wicked nation and its dissolute capital, or warn the Jews of dangers approaching from that quarter; and the invasions of Judah and Israel by the successive Assyrian kings Pul, Tiglath-Pileser, Shalmaneser, Sennacherib, and Esarhaddon, together with the conquest and captivity of the ten tribes, are related with some particularity. All these allusions and accounts recognize the unmatched power of the invaders. About the year 650 before Christ, Assyria ceases to be mentioned in the Old Testament, except by Ezekiel, who lived to celebrate its fall.

And, soon after that date, it ceased forever to be an empire. Though the catastrophe is related in various ways by different Greek authorities, yet the fact appears to be sufficiently ascertained that Assyria fell at once, from the height of worldly power and apparently of moral corruption, into final dismemberment under its Median and Babylonian tributaries, who became its conquerers; its huge capital being overthrown, partly burned, and then forsaken, and probably its other principal cities ruined, in the same victorious outbreak. This was about the year 606 before Christ; when Tarquin I. was reigning at Rome, Solon beginning his career at Athens, Pharaoh-Necho king at Memphis in Egypt, and Josiah in Jerusalem.

From that day to this, the general decay seems to have gone on, with but few and partial interruptions. Magnificent cities desolate, their skeleton-forms left to perish in solitude; a once great and enterprising people, wasting away, or already wasted away, into a scanty, mongrel and inert population, and dispersed in villages that shifted their site from age to age; instead of the once brisk intercourse of civilization, only a paltry, huckstering trade, and the occasional passage of wandering Arabs from the

[2] Numb. xxiv. 22, 24. [3] Ps. lxxxiii. 8.

Digitized by Google

desert: such has been the usual condition of the country for twenty-four centuries. In modern times, the traveller, who passes along the Tigris, or who strikes across the almost treeless plains and naked hills of the interior, sees everywhere the peculiar aspect of a soil that has undergone decomposition by an ancient culture and subsequent neglect. All wears the features of extreme age. Here and there, he comes upon mounds of a mysterious appearance, some of them so huge as to form hills that are seen from afar. Under these lies buried the magnificence of ancient Assyria. In many places he finds a considerable extent of country marked by fragments of brick and pottery, that are exposed on the surface, or are turned up by every furrow of the plough: the last visible relics of towns that flourished there three thousand years ago. His "tread is on an empire's dust." It is the counterpart of the great ruins of Babylonia, only more decayed, and sunk deeper into the earth. Mr. Layard says,

"Were the traveller to cross the Euphrates to seek for such ruins in Mesopotamia and Chaldæa as he left behind him in Asia Minor or Syria, his search would be in vain. The graceful column rising above the thick foliage of the myrtle, the ilex and the oleander; the gradines of the amphitheatre covering the gentle slope, and overlooking the waters of a lake-like bay; the richly carved cornice or capital half-hidden by the luxuriant herbage, —are replaced by the stern shapeless mound, rising like a hill from the scorched plain, the fragments of pottery and the stupendous mass of brick-work occasionally laid bare by the winter rains. He has left the land where nature is still lovely; where, in his mind's eye, he can rebuild the temple or the theatre, half-doubtful whether they would have made a more grateful impression on the senses than the ruin before him. He is, now, at a loss to give any form to the rude heaps upon which he is gazing. Those of whose works they are the remains, unlike the Roman and the Greek, have left no visible traces of their civilization or of their arts; their influence has long since passed away. The more he conjectures, the more vague the results appear. The scene around is worthy of the ruin he is contemplating; desolation meets desolation; a feeling of awe succeeds to wonder; for there is nothing to relieve the mind, to lead to hope, or to tell of what has gone by. These huge mounds of Assyria made a deeper impression upon me, gave rise to more serious thought and more earnest reflection, than the temples of Balbec or the theatres of Ionia." Vol. i. pp. 28, 29.

Digitized by Google

It would be impracticable to enumerate the different sites of these ruins, scattered as they are over the dismal plains of Mesopotamia and the country east of the Tigris; and we purposely pass by the relics of all such large cities even, as are supposed to have risen, or to have flourished, after the fall of the Assyrian empire. But some of the most extensive mounds, of the earlier date, form too remarkable a feature in the landscape, and are too significant as historical monuments, to be overlooked.

One of the largest is that of Koprak Kalaa, as it is called by the Turks, or by the Arabs, Kalah Shergat. It stands on the western bank of the Tigris, twenty-six miles above the passage of the river through the Hamrine range of hills, and about a hundred and forty miles above Bagdad. Ainsworth, the traveller, says that though he had become familiar with the Birs Nimrod, Mujellibe, Orchoë, and other Babylonian ruins, yet the view of this stupendous heap filled him with astonishment. The entire mountain of perished brick-work is nearly three miles in circumference, but of unequal height; ascending from a moderate elevation above the plain at the south, to 60 or 70 feet at the northern and perpendicular side. It looks more aged than the neighboring hills. Parts of this immense ruin, especially towards the centre, may indeed be composed of natural eminences, (for the country around is very uneven,) of which advantage was taken in constructing the great platform on which the range of palaces and temples was founded. On the summit of the mound, at the north, rises a pyramidal pile 40 feet still higher, and 940 feet in circumference at its lofty base. The upper portion of the whole extensive mass of ruins we have described, appears to consist of sun-dried bricks, which once stood up in walls, but which have long since crumbled and fallen together, underlying a surface of dust a dozen feet thick, the accumulation of twenty centuries. With them are mixed kiln-burned bricks, inscribed with arrow-headed characters, fragments of vases, alabaster, and of pottery, and some large slabs of hewn stone. It may be well to observe, here, that such in general is the formation of all the Assyrian piles of rubbish. Outside of this mound, for three or four miles into the plain at the south, there are smaller ruins scattered along the bank of the river, indicating the

Digitized by Google

extent that was occupied by a great city; of which, however, written history is utterly silent, or, if it pronounces the name, leaves us without the means of identifying the locality. Is this the primeval Resen? is it the Calah, of Nimrod, mentioned in Genesis?

Passing up the Tigris nearly fifty miles further, and leaving unnoticed several smaller heaps of ruins on our way, we reach the mouth of the Greater Zab. For a great distance, in his approach, the traveller sees a large and high mound standing out in the plain a little to the southeast of the confluence of the two rivers. Under the modern name of Keshaf, it serves as the prominent land-mark to all the region round about; for the level country stretches off afar in every direction, except the northwest and southeast, where the prospect is varied, at a few miles distance, by low ranges of broken land. Keshaf is a long artificial hill, of sun-dried bricks, now crumbled; the whole coated over like that of Kalah Shergat with a deep covering of earth. It is about 60 or 70 feet high, with a top that seems evened off as flat as a table-leaf, and with a lower eminence of similar composition at its side. But of what city it is the ruins, is unknown, and for the present unknowable. Beyond it, to the north, and beyond the Zab, there stands also in sight the dusty gravel-colored pyramid of Nimrod, another colossal mass of ruins, half a dozen miles distant. Of this we shall have much to say in the sequel.

If we leave the Tigris, here, and turn our course to the right over the plain country that stretches out wide along the southern banks of the Zab, we come at length in view of a large circular mound, about forty miles between east and northeast from Keshaf. With a bulk of more than half a mile in circumference, it rises nearly to the height of 150 feet, ending like the former in a summit apparently level, though now crowned with modern fortifications and a considerable village. Far behind it, sweeping from the north around to the east, towers the great chain of the Carduchian mountains. Here is the site of the ancient city, Arbela, renowned in the history of Alexander's campaign against Darius, as having given its name to the decisive battle between the Macedonians and the Persians. Hither Darius fled, and was pursued by his conqueror, the night after

Digitized by Google

his defeat. Its earlier history is unknown; but the peculiar structure and composition of its mound seem to show that it was one of the old Assyrian cities, which either escaped the general devastation at the overthrow of the empire, or subsequently revived. It was a place of some importance nearly three hundred years afterwards, in the time of Alexander the Great; and in later ages it has flourished to a considerable extent, under the name of Erbil. At present it is reduced to a village of some fifteen hundred houses, built chiefly on the level top of the artificial hill, though partly at its foot.

But the district that seems most to abound with these enormous heaps of ancient rubbish, lies along the east bank of the Tigris, from the mouth of the Zab, for some twenty-seven miles, up to the ruins opposite the present city of Mosul; and it reaches back about a dozen miles into the interior. Within this oblong tract, are the mounds of Nimrod, already mentioned, those of Yarumjeh, Nebbi Yunus, and Koyunjik, of Khorsabad, Baasheikha, Baazani, Keramles, Karagoush, and Husseini, besides others of a smaller size. Some of these have been recently excavated, but none of them thoroughly explored.

The ruins at Nimrod are six or seven miles, a little east of north, from Keshaf, or the mouth of the Zab, and about two miles east of the Tigris. Standing on an eminence on the west bank of the latter river, we look directly across the stream down upon a broad plain, and see it partially closed in, at the east, by a line of lofty mounds, with one of a pyramidal form rising high above the rest. The sides of all appear to be very steep, and fall down pretty uniformly in straight lines, like the sides of a huge embankment of gravel or sand; here and there they are notched at the edge with deep recesses, on either side of which bold promontories stand out; the summits, (except that of the pyramid,) seem at a distance almost as level as the top of a rail-road elevation. The largest mound is 116 rods long from south to north, 63 rods wide, and 50 or 60 feet high. At the north-west corner of this, the great pyramidal heap, apparently of earth, rises to the height of 144 feet, from a base of more than 100 rods in circumference. Several other large mounds rise near by; scattered ruins are seen for a wide extent around; and the surface of the plain is every-

Digitized by Google

where marked by fragments of pottery, and kiln-burned bricks inscribed with arrow-headed characters. A small village, called Nimrod, stands a mile out on the plain at the west of the mounds, and another, called Naifa, near their foot. Four hundred years before Christ, Xenophon led the ten thousand Greeks through these ruins, in their celebrated retreat, and left a description of the place as he saw it: a great city, inhabited in ancient times by the Medes, but then desolate, called Larissa; the walls of which were still 25 feet thick, 100 feet in height, and six miles in circuit; all built of brick, except the plinth, which was of stone and 20 feet high. Close to the city stood a pyramid of stone (probably, however, it was only cased with stone,) 100 feet square, and 200 feet in height. The casing of stone has fallen down, doubtless ages ago, and the summit of the pile has sunk to the measurement we have given. In the bed of the Tigris, above and below Nimrod, there are also remains of two dams, running across the river. They were constructed evidently in remote antiquity, for purposes of irrigation. When the stream is low, the upper one appears above the surface, occasioning a small cataract; and at such times it is seen to have been formed of large stones cemented with lime. The other, some two or three miles below, seldom shows itself above water. Both, however, were once much higher; and even now they produce violent and dangerous rapids in the current, whose roaring is heard at a considerable distance.

About eighteen miles yet further up the east bank of the Tigris, Xenophon came to an uninhabited castle, standing near the great city Mespila, which was once occupied by the Medes, but then forsaken. The former was the present Yarumjeh; the latter, the celebrated ruins opposite Mosul. Yarumjeh is an old Assyrian mound, about 70 rods long from southeast to northwest, and 42 feet high. It has been broken away, on its western end, by the current of the river; and down this precipitous face are disclosed remains of ancient structures, layers of large stones, with bitumen on some of them, and a few burned bricks and tiles. A modern village, from which the artificial hill takes its name, stands on the southern side. The summit commands a distant view of the dark long ridges and heaps

Digitized by Google

that mark the plain over against Mosul. To these we now proceed.

The celebrated ruins, which have been generally regarded, at least for the last seven centuries,[4] as the remains of Nineveh, begin three miles north of Yarumjeh, and extend four miles onwards in a direction nearly northwest, with a breadth from one and a half to two miles. They appear as walls of earth sunk into the ground and covered with turf, — continuous ridges, 10, 15, and 25 feet high, — some of which serve to enclose the whole area, some to divide it into sections; signs of old trenches are seen at their

[4] Benjamin of Tudela, the Jewish traveller, who was here about A. D., 1174, mentions Mosul, under the form Al-Mutsal, and says, "this city is the beginning of Persia, and retains its ancient greatness, seated on the river Hiddekel, (Tigris.) Between it and the ancient Nineveh there is only a bridge. But Nineveh is utterly destroyed; yet there are streets and many castles within the ancient circuit; and at one league's distance is the city Adbael." What place this last name represents, I know not. (Purchas, Lib. ix. c. 5. § 13.)

Among the Arabians at least, the site was known as that of Nineveh two hundred years still earlier; for one of their writers in the middle of the 10th century, places the "ruins of Nineveh" here, and says that, in his time, there were yet to be seen walls, and some statues, with inscriptions. (Ritter, Erdkunde, Th. xi. S. 223.)

I think that Tacitus also marks this spot as the site of Nineveh, in his account of the expedition of the Parthian Meherdates, A. D. 49. He marched from Edessa through the mountains on the borders of Mesopotamia and Armenia, descended at length into "the open country," crossed the Tigris, and came into Adiabene,—evidently above Mosul. Then, "in the course of their march, they took the city of Ninos, the most ancient seat of the Assyrian monarchy. They took also the castle of Arbela, memorable for the last battle between Darius and Alexander." (Annal. xii. 13.) From their crossing of the Tigris, to Arbela, their route would lay through the site of these ruins. Strabo, and Ammianus Marcellinus, however, seem to place Nineveh nearer the junction of the Zab with the Tigris, — in the vicinity of Nimrod.

But notwithstanding tradition had so long pointed to the ruins opposite Mosul, or to the neighborhood, as the site of Nineveh, still the question was generally felt by travellers and scholars to be unsettled and encumbered with many difficulties. Even Mr. Rich who spent some time, in 1820, in examining the ancient mounds and walls, hesitated to prounounce what city it was that stood here. We may judge of the uncertainty in which the point was involved, from the fact that, about twenty years ago, the celebrated German scholar, Mannert, in his great standard work on the "Geography of the Greeks and Romans," placed ancient Nineveh on the Euphrates and in the province of Babylonia.—*Geographie der Griechen und Römer, 5ter Theil, 2te Abtheilung*, (*Leipz.* 1829,) 328–330.

Digitized by Google

sides; fragments of bricks and pottery and a few hewn stones are scattered around; and here and there, broad massive elevations of square form, sharp angles, and steep sides, under which the ancient palaces and castles lie buried. The most prominent of these old mounds are now called Nebbi Yunus and Koyunjik; the latter nearly a mile northwest of the former. They are about the same distance east of the present channel of the Tigris, and stand in full view of Mosul on its opposite bank. Both of them align with what seems to have been the great western wall of the city, which runs as a chord straight across a wide outward curve of the river. Nebbi Yunus, which takes its name from a reputed tomb of the prophet Jonah on its top, is 26 rods long, 21 wide, and 50 feet high; Koyunjik is about a mile and a half in circumference, with a level summit 43 feet in height. When Xenophon passed through this place, twenty-two hundred and fifty years ago, and two hundred after its desolation, he found the walls of brick yet standing 100 feet high and 50 thick, upon a stone plinth of the same width and half its height. They were (so he says,) eighteen miles in circuit: denoting a space, however, far greater than the present ruins occupy, but not a tenth so large as is assigned to ancient Nineveh. [5]

The country from Nimrod up to these ruins is tolerably level on the river, though varied the latter part of the way by wide low swells. The southern portion of the district is a great plain that stretches from the Tigris across to the Zab, and indeed much further eastward. The northern is of a more broken surface, inland; and here the tract is bounded on the northeast by the Makloube range of hills, which runs along nearly parallel with the Tigris, a dozen or fourteen miles distânt. Over these, and on the extreme verge of the horizon in the north, the Kurdish mountains lift their white heads, gleaming with perpetual snow. We

[5] For the distances on the Tigris, and for many facts concerning the condition of the several masses of ruins, see Rich's Residence in Koordistan, Ainsworth's Travels in the Track of the Ten Thousand, Lynch's Map and Survey of the Tigris in the 9th vol. of the Journal of the Royal Geographical Society of London, and Ritter's Erdkunde, Th. ix, x. The last work contains the fullest, and indeed, the only *particular*, account I have seen of M. Botta's excavations at Khorsabad.

Digitized by Google

have already observed that the district which we have now marked out, is distinguished for the number of its mounds. About twelve miles a little east of north from Nebbi Yunus, is the village of Khorsabad, on the rivulet Khausser, and at the northwest end of the Makloube range. Early Arabian geographers mention it as occupying the site of an ancient Assyrian city; and here we find a hill, partly artificial and partly natural, on which the modern village stood till it was recently displaced in the process of excavation. It will ever be renowned as the spot where the first discovery was made, about six years ago, of the long-buried Assyrian palaces. The mound runs east and west; at the latter termination, the ruins were fortunately reached, and uncovered of the superincumbent mass of earth. This is the extreme northern point of the tract to which we have alluded. Turning back now, in our survey, and passing around under the southwestern side of the Makloube hills, we come to the mounds that rise over the present villages of Baazani and Baasheikha, about eight miles southeast of Khorsabad, and eleven northeast of Nebbi Yunus. Some ten miles further south, and about the same distance east of the Tigris, is the mound of Keramles or Kermalis. The village stands on the road from Mosul and Nebbi Yunus to Erbil. About four miles still further south, and six inland from the Tigris, are the mound and village of Karagoush. And finally, as we approach our starting-point again, we see, on the great plain off to the east, the mound of Husseini, about eleven miles northeast from Nimrod, and not far from the hither side of the Zab.

Which, of all the ruins we have mentioned, is that of Nineveh? None of them approaches the extent of its area. The ancient city is said, by the Greek historians and geographers, to have been larger even than Babylon; and Diodorus Siculus, on the authority probably of the traveller Ctesias, gives it definitely a length of eighteen or nineteen miles, with a breadth of eleven or twelve, and a compass of about sixty miles. According to the book of Jonah, it "was an exceeding great city of three days' journey;" and the prophet seems to have entered it "a days' journey" before he announced his message. It contained also "more than six-score thousand persons who could not

Digitized by Google

discern between their right hand and their left hand;" which, if spoken of young children, would imply a population of at least six hundred thousand. Howsoever we interpret this language, it is impossible to reduce the terms of measurement to the limits of any one group of vestiges that we have described, or that is now to be found in the country. Nor will it obviate the difficulty to suppose that the outer and main wall ran off at so great a distance from these central mounds as to enclose the given dimensions. For the walls are said to have been 100 feet high, and wide enough for three chariots to go abreast upon them, with fifteen hundred towers rising at intervals to twice that height. Allow if we please for any supposable exaggeration, still such an enormous range of dried-brick and stone-work, though fallen down, and sunk into the soil, and perished, must have left a great ridge, easily traced at this day, along the surface of the country. This is actually the case in the comparatively small areas around Nebbi Yunus and other ruins. There is, however, nothing of the kind, anywhere, that answers to the vast extent of Nineveh. The conclusion, to which the most judicious explorers of the East have come, is, that the walls enclosed only certain quarters of the city, where the public buildings stood; and that, between these magnificent piles, there were large tracts occupied by streets of private dwellings, by gardens, commons, and fields, which had no defence except perhaps, a bank of earth.[6] According to Diodorus and Quintus Curtius, there was, in the case of Babylon, open space enough within its precincts to cultivate corn for the sustenance of the whole population in time of seige; and from the expression in Jonah, that there was "much cattle" in Nineveh, it may be inferred that there was also pasture for them. Ancient Asiatic cities greatly differed, in these respects, from modern European.

Mr. Layard proposes the hypothesis that Nineveh extended lengthwise from Nimrod up the Tigris to the mounds opposite Mosul, and thence, in width, obliquely to Khorsabad; that, from this very sharp corner, the eastern boundary ran first along the southwestern foot of the

[6] This remark will apply also to Babylon, and other ancient cities of central Asia.

Digitized by Google

Makloube hills, and then down to Keramles, or possibly to Husseini; whence a line drawn southwest to Nimrod, would mark the lower and older end of the city: the whole forming an oblong quadrangle (technically a rhomboid,) of the dimensions given by Diodorus, and answering to the distance indicated by the prophet. The large mounds are supposed to mark the sites of the principal groups of royal edifices, which were founded at successive periods, and distinguished perhaps by different names. With all deference to an opinion formed by Mr. Layard on the spot, we are led by the estimates of other travellers to doubt whether his outline does not too obviously exceed the measurements even of the Greek historian. When we consider also that there are other neighboring mounds outside of his plan, especially to the north, it may seem arbitrary to draw the limits precisely where he fixes them. But that this is very nearly the area occupied by the city, appears to be sufficiently established by comparing ancient notices with the present features of the country, and still more by recent discoveries among the ruins. Our author says it is evident "that buildings were once spread over the space above described; for besides the vast number of small mounds everywhere visible, scarcely a husbandman drives his plough over the soil without exposing the vestiges of former habitations. Each quarter of the city may have had its distinct name; hence the palace of Evorita where Saracus destroyed himself, and the Mespila and Larissa of Xenophon, applied respectively to the ruins at Koyunjik and Nimroud."

Six years ago, the monuments of ancient Assyria remained in the state in which we have now surveyed them. All was a buried mystery; only the sepulchre, as it were, was visible. The traveller through the country, who saw the mounds and other vestiges of antiquity, wondered and conjectured, but could nowhere clear away the uncertainty. The Orientalist, Mr. Rich, had indeed carefully examined the site opposite Mosul, in 1820, and made some excavations at Koyunjik; the few bricks, however, which he succeeded in digging out, inscribed with arrow-headed characters, and the relics he discovered on the surface, served rather to tantalize than to gratify inquiry. But a new era was

Digitized by Google

introduced by the historian of the American Revolution, M. Botta, while French consul at Mosul, in 1843 and 1844. After an ineffectual attempt at Koyunjik, he was fortunately induced to make trial in the mound of Khorsabad. Here his workmen soon came upon the top of a wall, a few feet below the surface; and by months of labor in penetrating to the foundation, digging the earth out from several corridors and apartments, and removing the mass of soil and dust from above, they laid completely open an Assyrian edifice: the first probably that had been exposed to the view of man for more than two thousand years; the still fresh relic of an age that was already lost in antiquity when Herculaneum and Pompeii were buried. All the walls were sculptured over with bas-reliefs, illustrating the personal appearance of the people, their dress, utensils, customs, occupations, forms of social and civil life, especially their arms and modes of warfare. Some of the groups appear to commemorate historical incidents; others represent religious mythology. Above and below these ranges of sculpture, there are numerous arrow-headed inscriptions; and a name, doubtless that of the reigning sovereign, occurs in different places, included within cartouches according to a well known practice of the ancient Egyptians and Persians. It was a royal palace, which M. Botta had brought to light. The foundation on which it stood was a great surrounding platform, of singular construction: several horizontal layers of kiln-burned brick, placed one above another, between which were strata of sand, each about six inches thick, and the whole strongly cemented together with bitumen. The upper layer, forming the surface of the surrounding court, is everywhere inscribed with the arrow-headed characters. Within the building, the floor is paved with flat stones, also inscribed in like manner, and the characters inlaid with copper which has long since perished. Both the external and the partition walls of the palace seem to have been formed by setting up long slabs of gypsum or alabaster lime-stone in two parallel rows, several feet apart, and by filling the space between with clayey earth, or possibly with sun-dried bricks which have crumbled into a solid mass of dust. These encasing slabs are not more than three inches thick, and appear to have been held in their place, against the

Digitized by Google

outpressing weight within, by rods and copper bands, of which there remain some traces. The apartments or halls, though narrow, are of great length and of considerable height; and it is difficult to imagine a more splendid appearance than they must have presented, when their polished alabaster sides, all covered with bas-reliefs and inscrptions, were yet in their transparent freshness, and variegated with the brightest colors, which have not wholly lost their hues even to this day. Unhappily, the palace was burned, or at least greatly injured by fire, at the time of its downfall; and no sooner was it laid open again to the air, than its alabaster slabs, with their sculptures and inscriptions, began to crumble away like slacking lime. Drawings of the most important, however, were secured on the spot, and some of the figures have been preserved entire and transported to France.

M. Botta's discoveries formed an epoch in our knowledge of Assyrian antiquities; but they have since been eclipsed. Mr. Layard had already travelled the Tigris repeatedly from Mosul to Bagdad. As he passed and repassed the ancient vestiges along its banks, he had been peculiarly impressed by the mysterious aspect of the monuments at Nimrod, and by the fixed traditions of the inhabitants, who assigned their origin to "the mighty hunter before the Lord." It does not belong to our plan to describe the perseverance with which he sought the means of exploring them, nor the tact and resolution with which he afterwards accomplished his enterprise. At length, in the autumn of 1845, he set out from Constantinople, crossed the mountains of Pontus and the plains of upper Mesopotamia in post-haste, and on the eve of the 8th of November, rested at the clay-village of Naifa in front of the mounds. Sinking a shaft, the next day, into the principal mound, at its northwest corner, near the great pyramid, his workmen immediately struck on the upper chambers of a palace, which proved in the sequel to be the most ancient that has yet been discovered. When exhumed, it was found to be of similar construction with that of Khorsabad; standing on a similar great platform, which was built up solid some thirty or forty feet above the level of the plain; its walls composed in like manner of sun-dried bricks, and encased in the same way with sculptured slabs

Digitized by Google

of gypsum, inscribed with arrow-headed characters. Imagine a party of Arabs and Kurdish Nestorians, under our traveller's direction, cutting a narrow trench down through dust, heaps of dried bricks in all stages of crumbling, masses of soil mixed with fragments of glass, pottery, alabaster and rubbish, to the depth of twenty feet from the surface; and on reaching the great platform at the bottom, carrying their excavations horizontally along the pictured sides of the walls, and opening upon new discoveries at every advance! So far as the edifice has been thus dug out, it appears to be nearly 300 feet square, including what was probably a great open court in the centre, and contains between fifteen and twenty halls or apartments on the floor. These are of different dimensions; from 50 to 170 feet long, and from 20 to 35 feet wide. The sides are everywhere pannelled with the upright slabs of alabaster to a height of 9 or 12 feet; and this is about as high as the buried walls remain in a standing position; thence upward to the ceiling they are supposed to have been faced with burned brick, plaistered over and painted in bright colors. This upper part, however, had fallen down, ages ago, and filled all the passages and rooms with the enormous load of its clayey contents. As the apartments show no signs of windows, they were probably lighted by large apertures above. The walls of the palace and the partitions within are from 5 to 15 feet thick, composed in the manner we have described. The whole was probably covered with a roof of timber, since remains of beams are found in the ruins, particularly under fallen slabs. The wood, when laid open, appeared to be entire; but when touched, it crumbled into dust. On excavating the main entrances of the building and of the halls, the workmen found them guarded, as it were, by pairs of colossal statues of winged lions and bulls with human heads. These were from 10 to 16 feet high, carved out of pure white alabaster, and inscribed with arrow-headed characters. The bas-reliefs on the walls and flooring of the interior bring the people before us in all their forms of life; in their battles, triumphs, capture of cities, government, agriculture, mechanics, traffic, social and domestic customs, and religious or mythological ideas; and when the accompanying inscriptions shall have been decyphered, as they are likely to be,

Digitized by Google

they will doubtless supply the historical commentary on the whole, which we now want. Indeed, by giving the name and brief genealogy of the reigning monarch, enclosed in cartouches, they have already enabled the antiquarian to approximate the date of the edifice; and, by a comparison of other facts, to carry the period of its erection back at least 1200 years before Christ. While exploring it, Mr. Layard also excavated a building of nearly as great dimensions in the southwestern corner of the mound; afterwards he partially uncovered one at the southeastern corner; and penetrated into another not far from the centre; besides carrying two trenches into the heart of the great pyramid. He found the southwestern palace lined with many slabs that were evidently taken from the northwestern after its destruction; thus indicating a considerable period between the ruin of the one and the commencement of the other. It appeared also by the respective genealogies in the cartouches, that the king who built the older, was an ancestor of him who built the later. And finally, tombs of a very ancient date, and apparently of Egyptian structure, had been founded on the rubbish above the remains of the northwestern palace, and then covered up in their turn by the accumulating dust of subsequent ages. If we may use a geological term, two strata of cizilization, with two intermediate strata of barbarism, lie above the ruins of the oldest and principal palace.

At the close of his labors, here, in April, 1847, Mr. Layard was directed by the British Museum, under whose orders he acted, to cover up the remains again, in order to protect them from injury. But, says he,

"before leaving Nimroud and reburying its palaces, I would wish to lead the reader once more through the ruins of the principal edifice, and to convey as distinct an idea as I am able of the excavated halls and chambers, as they appeared when fully explored. Let us imagine ourselves issuing from my tent near the village in the plain. On approaching the mound, not a trace of building can be perceived, except a small mud hut covered with reeds, erected for the accommodation of my Chaldæan workmen. We ascend this artificial hill, but still see no ruins, not a stone protruding from the soil. There is only a broad level platform before us, perhaps covered with a luxuriant crop of barley; or, may be, yellow and parched, without a blade of vegetation, ex-

Digitized by Google

cept here and there a scanty tuft of camel-thorn. Low, black heaps surrounded by brushwood and dried grass, a thin column of smoke issuing from the midst of them, may be seen here and there. These are the tents of the Arabs. . . . . We will descend into the principal trench, by a flight of steps rudely cut into the earth near the western face of the mound. As we approach it, we find a party of Arabs bending on their knees, and intently gazing at something beneath them. Each holds his long spear, tufted with ostrich-feathers, in one hand; and in the other, the halter of his mare, which stands patiently behind him. The party consists of a Bedouin Sheikh from the desert, and his followers; who, having heard strange reports of the wonders of Nimroud, have made several days' journey to remove their doubts and satisfy their curiosity. He rises as he hears us approach; and if we wish to escape the embrace of a very dirty stranger, we had better at once hurry into the trenches. We descend about twenty feet, and suddenly find ourselves between a pair of colossal lions, winged and human-headed, forming a portal. I have already described my feelings when gazing for the first time on these majestic figures. Those of the reader would probably be the same, particularly if caused by the reflection that before these wonderful forms Ezekiel, Jonah and others of the prophets stood, and Sennacherib bowed, that even the patriarch Abraham himself may possibly have looked upon them. In the subterraneous labyrinth which we have reached, all is bustle and confusion. Arabs are running about in different directions; some bearing baskets filled with earth, others carry the water-jars to their companions. The Chaldæans or Tiyari, in their striped dresses and curious conical caps, are digging with picks into the tenacious earth, raising a dense cloud of fine dust at every stroke. The wild strains of Kurdish music may be heard occasionally issuing from some distant part of the ruins, and, if they are caught by the parties at work, the Arabs join their voices in chorus, raise the war-cry, and labor with renewed energy. Leaving behind us a small chamber in which the sculptures are distinguished by a want of finish in the execution, and considerable rudeness in the design of the ornaments, we issue from between the winged lions, and enter the remains of the principal hall. On both sides of us are sculptured gigantic winged figures; some with the heads of eagles, others entirely human, and carrying mysterious symbols in their hands. To the left is another portal, also formed by winged lions. One of them has, however, fallen across the entrance, and there is just room to creep beneath it. Beyond this portal is a winged figure, and two slabs with bas-reliefs; but they have been so much injured that we can scarcely trace the

Digitized by Google

subject upon them. Further on, there are no traces of wall, although a deep trench has been opened. The opposite side of the hall has also disappeared, and we see only a high wall of earth. On examining it attentively, we can detect the marks of masonry; and we soon find that it is a solid structure built of unbaked clay, now of the same color as the surrounding soil, and scarcely to be distinguished from it. — The slabs of alabaster, fallen from their original position, have, however, been raised; and we tread in the midst of a maze of small bas-reliefs, representing chariots, horsemen, battles and sieges. Perhaps the workmen are about to raise a slab for the first time; and we watch with eager curiosity what new event of Assyrian history, or what unknown custom or religious ceremony, may be illustrated by the sculpture beneath.

Having walked about one hundred feet among these scattered monuments of ancient history and art, we reach another door-way formed by gigantic winged bulls in yellow limestone. One is still entire; but its companion has fallen and is broken into several pieces, — the great human head is at our feet. We pass on, without turning into the part of the building to which this portal leads. Beyond it, we see another winged figure, holding a graceful flower in its hand, and apparently presenting it as an offering to the winged bull. Adjoining this sculpture, we find eight fine bas-reliefs. There is the king, hunting, and triumphing over, the lion and wild bull; and the siege of the castle, with the battering ram. We have now reached the end of the hall, and find before us an elaborate and beautiful sculpture, representing two kings, standing beneath the emblem of the supreme deity, and attended by winged figures. Between them is the sacred tree. In front of this bas-relief is the great stone platform, upon which, in days of old, may have been placed the throne of the Assyrian monarch when he received his captive enemies, or his courtiers. — To the left of us is a fourth outlet from the hall, formed by another pair of lions. We issue from between them, and find ourselves on the edge of a deep ravine, to the north of which rises, high above us, the lofty pyramid. Figures of captives bearing objects of tribute, — ear-rings, bracelets, and monkeys, — may be seen on walls near this ravine; and two enormous bulls, and two winged figures above fourteen feet high, are lying on its very edge.

As the ravine bounds the ruins on this side, we must return to the yellow bulls. Passing through the entrance formed by them, we enter a large chamber surrounded by eagle-headed figures; at one end of it is a door-way guarded by two priests or divinities, and in the centre another portal with winged bulls. Whichever

Digitized by Google

way we turn, we find ourselves in the midst of a nest of rooms; and, without an acquaintance with the intricacies of the place, we should soon lose ourselves in this labyrinth. The accumulated rubbish being generally left in the centre of the chambers, the whole excavation consists of a number of narrow passages, pannelled on one side with slabs of alabaster; and shut in on the other by a high wall of earth, half-buried, in which may here and there be seen a broken vase, or a brick painted with brilliant colors. We may wander through these galleries for an hour or two, examining the marvellous sculptures, or the numerous inscriptions that surround us. Here we meet long rows of kings, attended by their eunuchs and priests; there, lines of winged figures carrying fir-cones and religious emblems, and seemingly in adoration before the mystic tree. Other entrances, formed by winged lions and bulls, lead us into new chambers. In every one of them are fresh objects of curiosity and surprise. At length, wearied, we issue from the buried edifice by a trench on the opposite side to that by which we entered, and find ourselves again upon the naked platform. We look around in vain for any traces of the wonderful remains we have just seen, and are half inclined to believe that we have dreamed a dream, or have been listening to some tale of Eastern romance." Vol. ii. pp. 88–93.

Having followed our explorer through the excavated trenches of this palace, let us accompany him to his tent on the plain out in front of the mounds, and take in the general prospect. In the summer, all is an arid, parched and dusty waste, across which the whirlwind occasionally sweeps, dragging with it a cloud of sand. But after the winter rains, the face of the great plain, and even the mounds, are covered with a short lively vegetation, everywhere thickly set with flowers. We look off on the broad level which reaches to a great distance around. As the sun goes down behind the low hills in the west, which separate the river from the desert of Mesopotamia, even their ledgy sides reflect a verdant hue. The receding rays are gradually withdrawn, like a transparent veil, from the landscape, and the last glow of light smiles over the pure cloudless sky. The great mounds throw their dark shadows far eastward across the plain. In the distance at the south, and beyond the Zab, whose waters we can here and there discern, the venerable ruin of Keshaf rises indistinctly into the evening mist. Still more distant, and still more indistinctly, appears a solitary hill at the eastward, which over-

Digitized by Google

looks the ancient city of Arbela. Away far in the north, beyond the low undulating country, the mountains of Kurdistan faintly show their summits of perpetual snow, on which the dying sunbeams yet linger, struggling with the universal twilight. The bleating of sheep and lowing of cattle, at first faintly heard, become louder as the flocks return from their pastures and wander among the tents. Girls hurry over the greensward to seek their fathers' cattle, or crouch down to milk those which have already returned. Some are coming from the river, bearing the full pitcher on their heads or shoulders; others, no less graceful in their form and erect in their carriage, are bringing the heavy load of long grass which they have cut in the meadows. Sometimes a party of horsemen may be seen in the distance, slowly approaching, the tufts of ostrich feathers which top their long spears showing darkly against the evening sky. The plain now glimmers with innumerable fires. As the night advances, they vanish one by one, until the landscape is wrapped in darkness, and in silence, only disturbed by the barking of the Arab dog.

While Mr. Layard was yet conducting the work at Nimrod, he sent a party to Kalah Shergat; and, following them a few days afterwards, he found that they had excavated, from the great hill of ruins, a sitting statue as large as life, carved out of black basalt. The square block on which the figure sat was covered on three sides with an arrow-headed inscription. In this, as well as in that of a brick brought to him, he discovered a short genealogical list, which showed the reigning monarch to have been the son of the founder of the oldest palace at Nimrod; thus ascertaining the later origin of these ruins at Kalah Shergat. The danger to which the workmen were exposed from hostile tribes of Arabs, and the brief time allowed them to prosecute their labor, prevented them from reaching the great platform on which the original edifices must have been erected. They dug out the ruins of some ancient walls, however, and fragments of stone with arrow-headed characters. Many tombs also were uncovered, which, like those at Nimrod, had been made long after the destruction of the Assyrian edifice, as they stood in the rubbish and earth accumulated above it. But no sculptures

Digitized by Google

in bas-relief were found, nor traces of alabaster slabs: the material itself being unknown in this part of the country.

After his final departure from Nimrod, he made an attempt on the great mound of Koyunjik, in which neither Mr. Rich nor M. Botta had succeeded. Fixing on the southwest corner of the mound, he sank his trenches through the rubbish to the depth of twenty feet, before the foundation-platform of sun-dried bricks was reached. By carrying the excavations, as usual, along the surface of this, the workmen in a few days came upon a wall; and at the close of a month's labor, they had laid open a considerable portion of an ancient Assyrian palace, of like construction with those already described. The extent of the entire structure is unknown; the part explored seems about 250 feet in length from south to north, and 225 feet wide, consisting of nine halls. One of these is nearly 160 feet by 45; another, of the same breadth; a third, 120 by 25 feet. The walls between are from 16 to 20 feet thick; and at the principal entrances were found the great winged bulls with human heads. All the apartments and passages were lined with slabs of alabaster, sculptured, and inscribed with arrow-headed characters. From the genealogical lists in the cartouches, it appears that the royal builder was the son of the founder of Khorsabad, and the immediate predecessor of the king who erected the latest palace at Nimrod. The origin of Koyunjik may therefore be placed long after the date of the northwest edifice in the former mound, and one generation before that of the southwest. Wherever the alabaster slabs remained entire, they were of a very large size; many of them 10 feet high by 8 or 9 wide. But as the structure appears to have been destroyed by fire, the casings in most places crumbled on exposure, and some of them were already so thoroughly decomposed that nothing was left of them except a white deposit of lime. It is hardly necessary to add that, besides the ruins of this palace, many scattered fragments of sculptured stone, inscribed bricks, pottery, and other antiquities, were brought to light. After Mr. Layard's departure, his friend, Mr. Ross, continued the excavations at Koyunjik. Removing his workmen to the opposite, or northern side of the mound, he laid open part of another similar edifice. This, too, owed its destruction to fire;

Digitized by Google

and the burnt slabs, full of bas-reliefs and arrow-headed inscriptions, began to crumble on exposure. At the last advices, Mr. Ross had found the accumulation so great above the ruins, that, instead of sinking trenches, he was tunnelling it to reach the sculptures. It is probable that all the palaces built on this platform, or eminence, perished in the same conflagration, which seems to have reached from the southern extremity to the northern. It should be observed, too, that all the buildings, fragments of brick, and other monuments, hitherto discovered at Koyunjik, Nebbi Yunus, and in the surrounding area, appear to belong to one epoch; and if we may judge from the name of the reigning monarch inscribed upon them, they were executed by the son of the founder of Khorsabad.

We have only to add, that, during Mr. Layard's residence in the country, he made excavations also in the mounds of Baazani, Baasheikha, Keramles, Tel Yara, and Jerahiya, — all, except the last, within the limits which he assigns to Nineveh. But of these casual investigations, and of their results, he has given no particular account.

Amazing as the disclosures are, which we have now related, yet when we consider how very small a part they lay open of the whole visible field of Assyrian antiquities, we cannot suppose them sufficient to clear up the early history either of the empire or of the city. To say nothing of the vast number of smaller ruins everywhere scattered over the country, or of the inscribed tablets of rock which are found in the mountains of Kurdistan and in the passes into ancient Media; we must remember that, even of the great mounds, only those of Nimrod, Koyunjik, and Khorsabad have been excavated to any noticeable extent, and none of these thoroughly, except the last. The arrow-headed inscriptions on the slabs, which would doubtless explain many events and fix many dates, have not been decyphered, though some progress has been made in the perplexing task. What vestiges older than any yet found, what modifying circumstances, what countervailing facts, may come to light as the work of exploring shall be carried on, it would of course be impossible to conjecture at present; and we must be cautious in drawing

Digitized by Google

inferences from partial data. But the discoveries that have hitherto been made, all seem to point towards the following general conclusions: that Nimrod was the most ancient part of Nineveh, and the northwest palace, there, the first of the kind that was erected, — probably as early as the twelfth century before Christ, perhaps far earlier; that the founder of this edifice had conquered Bactria, and carried his victories into the borders of India; that, in the next generation, his son built the central palace in the same mound, and those of Baasheikha and Kalah Shergat; that a subsequent monarch (how long afterwards we know not,) added to the palaces at Nimrod; that a lapse of centuries followed, during which the original edifice in the northwest corner of the latter place, fell, and was covered with earth, and was forgotten, so that tombs were built by a new race above its remains; that during this period an intercourse either of war or of commerce was maintained between Assyria and Egypt; that subsequently the structures at Khorsabad and Keramles were erected; that a son of the founder of these built Koyunjik, Nebbi Yunus, and the surrounding quadrangle; and that *his* son was the builder of the southwest palace at Nimrod. Accordingly, this edifice, together with the ruins opposite Mosul, and those of Khorsabad and Keramles, belongs to the closing period of Assyrian history, when the empire, under Tiglath-Pileser and his successors, was probably at its greatest extent, embracing even Tyre and Sidon within its limits. The remarkable circumstance that all these later palaces, from Nimrod to Khorsabad, were destroyed by fire, and apparently at one epoch, seems to fix the catastrophe at some perid of general insurrection, or successful invasion. Two such events are mentioned by the Greek historians: the first, about the year 870 B. C., the second 606 B. C. Though Mr. Layard inclines to the former as the date of the conflagration, yet, as there are no traces of subsequent antiquities on the sites, we should think that the uninterrupted desolateness which appears to have followed, points to the latter, or the final ruin of the empire.

It would be exceedingly difficult to reduce within our limits a sketch of Assyrian civilization, of the arts of the people, their religion, customs, and forms of life, as illustrated by these antiquities. A few particulars must suffice.

Digitized by Google

The construction of their public edifices we have had occasion already to describe with so much particularity that we need not go over the whole ground again. The first step appears to have been to raise an immense platform to the height of thirty or forty feet, by strata of sun-dried bricks, finished at the top with layers of burned bricks, inscribed, and sometimes alternating with layers of sand. On this the structure was erected in one high story, with its thick walls pannelled without and within at the lower part, and encased above, or plastered and painted; the whole covered with roofs of wood, open perhaps over the centres of the several halls to admit the light. Though the arch was not unknown, only a few instances have been found. The private dwellings, which occupied the greatest part of the city, were sometimes of two or three low stories. They were formed probably of dried clay or brick, and easily demolished; so that but slight traces of them would remain a century or two after the place was abandoned. We have seen that Xenophon led his troops through the entire length of Nineveh, two hundred years after its desolation, without marking any thing except the piles of royal palaces, which he took to be separate cities. Seventy years still later, Alexander the Great marched through the eastern part of the area, had some skirmishes within its limits, and fought his decisive battle with Darius just outside the suburbs at the east; but the historians of his campaign take no notice of the ancient capital over whose remains he was passing.

Even at the date of the oldest palace of Nimrod, the people had evidently attained to a high degree of Asiatic civilization. It was the age at which Assyrian art appears in its most perfect state. Its purity afterwards declined, as has been the case with all nations in the advanced and deteriorating stages of their culture, when the influence of conventionalities interferes with the fresh study of nature, if it does not supersede it. The sculptures in the later monuments, at Koyunjik and Khorsabad, show perhaps greater skill of the workmen in handling their tools, and more delicacy of execution; but they are much inferior in the treatment of a subject, and in beauty and variety of form. In some of the earliest specimens, we find ornaments which were subsequently adopted in Greece, and

Digitized by Google

there perfected. It must not be supposed, however, that Assyrian taste and imagination were ever rigorously simple, like the Grecian; they were Asiatic, and delighted in compound forms and gorgeous coloring. The same style, at least the spirit of it, has always prevailed among the orientals. Its features enter into their poetry, and may be traced everywhere in the Bible itself.

The most ancient religion of the Assyrians was Sabæanism, or the worship of the heavenly bodies as types of the powers and attributes of the supreme Deity. In the bas-reliefs of the oldest monuments, we constantly meet with figures of the sun, moon, and stars, hung around the neck of the king, (who served also as priest,) in his devotions; and they are represented on chariots and other objects. Associated with these, there are indeed mythological designs and idolatrous forms; the general tone of them, however, appears to be severe and earnest. But in the far later age of Khorsabad and Koyunjik, the symbols and religious ceremonies pourtrayed, indicate the common prevalence of fire-worship, with the recognition of various deities and rites of a more corrupt character. We may observe, in this connection, that the drawings and descriptions given of these mythological emblems, as well as of other sculptures and images, illustrate with peculiar vividness the allusions of the prophets, especially of Ezekiel, to the figures inscribed and painted on the chambers of the Assyrian palaces. We see at once that the sacred writers drew their representations from a personal knowledge of the originals.

Their knowledge of the pure sciences cannot be ascertained from their monuments. But of their acquaintance with the practical arts, they have left abundant proofs. Besides painting and sculpture, in which they excelled, and architecture, in which they displayed their magnificence, the manufacture of woollen, linen, and silk stuffs, as well as the making and embroidering of splendid garments, appears to have reached a high degree of perfection among them. The transportation of the huge blocks of stone which are sometimes found in the ruins, is evidence of their proficiency in mechanics; though by what means they removed these heavy masses and lifted them to their place, is unknown,—probably, however, by applying the

Digitized by Google

pulley, which is represented on their bas-reliefs. They were expert in working iron, copper, silver and gold; they manufactured glass, in bottles and vases of elegant forms, specimens of which still remain; their carved ivories, inlaid sometimes with blue glass and other substances, are very beautiful, and of the highest finish. Among the few agricultural implements that are represented, we find the figure of a plough, nearly resembling our own. Chariots or cars, open behind but pannelled on the sides, with only one pair of wheels, with two horses, and containing three persons, were used by the king and his principal officers. The harness, as well as the car, was ornamented in the most gorgeous manner. Of their warlike panoply and instruments, besides helmets, coats of mail, shields, swords, spears, javelins, bows and arrows, we find the sculptures of engines for throwing stones, of battering-rams and movable towers filled with armed men. In the siege of a city or fortress, the two latter machines are represented as brought up to the lofty walls by means of a long inclined plane, the top of which was sometimes paved with bricks to facilitate the ascent. The besieged let down double chains or ropes, and caught the head of the engine to turn it aside and break the force of the blow. Boats and galleys, of tasteful forms, are likewise represented.

Mr. Layard devotes half of his second volume to an illustration of the arts and character of the ancient Assyrians; passing under review their architecture, manufactures, costume, ranks, military system and warlike customs, manners and private life, and religion. But we find on looking over our sketch of these topics, that it is too bald and skeleton-like to answer as a portrait; and we have not skill to improve it in the narrow space allowed us. We therefore conclude, by referring the reader, who would gain a clear idea of the subject, to that part of the work itself. Indeed, we have no thought of proposing this article a substitute for the rest of Mr. Layard's book, with such as are curious in the antiquities of the "exceeding great city of three days' journey"; though we would hope that our summary, and the arrangement we have given to our remarks, will be found by some to facilitate the perusal of the full and detailed narrative.

H. B. 2d.

Digitized by Google

Article XXIII.

Bushnell's Discourses.

God in Christ. Three Discourses, delivered at New Haven, Cambridge, and Andover, with a preliminary desertation on Language. By Horace Bushnell. Hartford: Byron & Parsons. 1849.

It would be easy to write a notice of this book, or to take a reader by the hand and lead him along through its novel theories, to admire their boldness, and to be charmed by the fresh eloquence in which they are robed; but to review it fairly and thoroughly, is a task which may well overwhelm the spirits of the writer to whom it is proposed. We frankly confess our inadequacy to the office we have assumed, and trust that the consciousness of failure will atone in part for the rashness of presumption. Nor do we believe that it is possible, within the limits of a review-essay, to do justice to this remarkable work. There are so many sides to it, the principles on which it is built require such patient and ample discussion, and so many points are tacitly assumed, that are still seriously debated by Christian scholars, and which, if differently interpreted, must impair the legitimacy of the author's most important conclusions, that a long treatise would be necessary for an adequate examination of its claims. Few books, we believe, have ever been written which upon the first perusal so interest and perplex a competent reader. While the boldness with which heresies are advanced is often most exhilirating, at times one is in doubt whether his reason is not intentionally insulted by the inconsistencies with which they are allied. At one time the author's severe and brilliant logic makes sad havoc with the doctrines of his friends, and soon he tells us that logic is a most unfair test of truth, for by it we can prove or disprove what we please. Before we have time to be amazed by the breadth of his principles, we are so disgusted by a narrow assumption as to be tempted to throw the book away. The conflict of feelings which it excites would be intolerable, were

Digitized by Google

it not for the charming originality of the style, which affords constant pleasure to the sense of beauty, and above all, for the deep and sweet religious spirit that envelopes and pervades its pages, and wins for the author a feeling of personal affection and esteem.

Dr. Bushnell's book consists of an Essay on Language, covering more than a hundred pages, and three Addresses; one delivered in New Haven, on the Divinity of Christ, one in Cambridge, on the Atonement, and one in Andover, on Dogma and Spirit. Very evidently the work is not published by the author solely as an expression of private opinion, nor is it merely an attempt to establish his orthodoxy in the judgment of his brethren. Dr. Bushnell's heart is fired with the hope, and his intellect tortured with the problem, of Christian Union. His ambition is to arrange a treaty of peace between the Unitarian and Orthodox Congregationalists of New England. He has long been trying to reconcile to his own reason the Orthodoxy of the creeds, and has succeeded in getting a stand-point sufficiently distant to make its dogmas look inviting. The long and elastic rope by which, in exchange for the customary halter, he is now tied to the old formulas, allows him full sweep into any fields where he may please to enter, and he naturally enough concludes that the general acceptance of similar bonds would confer upon the Church all the blessings of unity and all the pleasures of freedom.

The fundamental proposition of his system is that Christians can never come into a settled consent until we better understand the nature, capacities and incapacities of language as a vehicle of truth. The distractions and multiplicities of opinion, the errors and sects and strifes of Christendom have sprung from a mistake in accepting words not as signs or images, but as absolute measures and equivalents of truth, and from receiving and insisting upon whatever conclusions the *logical forms* of words may be made to yield.

It is necessary, therefore, that we should first of all understand the capacities of speech as a channel of mental intercourse. There are two departments in language: the physical which provides names for things, and in which names are representatives of things, and the intellectual, in which names of things are representatives of thought.

Digitized by Google

The names of things, with the exception of some words which represent sounds, he thinks are perfectly arbitrary. But all our abstract or mental terms are really poetic terms, expressing analogies between physical facts and inward feelings. Spirit is breath; expectation is a reaching forward; reflection, a bending back; glory is brightness; faith, a ligature; right is something straight; wrong, something twisted. There is a *logos* in the forms of things by which they are prepared to serve as types or images of what is inmost in our souls.

This being so, it follows that we have no terms in the spiritual department of language that are exact representatives of thought. They never convey adequately, but only hint, or put another in the way of reproducing the same thought. They cannot, by use, settle down into a perfectly unambiguous sense. The only words which can be said to have a perfectly determinate significance are those which relate to our necessary ideas, such as time, space, cause, truth, right, and mathematical relations. All other mental phrases, even the most common and familiar, convey to every man what his own life-experience, his theories and mental struggles, have made them, and these give to them a color quite peculiar to himself. Hence if a commnnicating party offers pure truth, in the best and freshest forms of expression that language can provide, the truth received will depend on the ingenuousness or moral obliquity, the capacity or incapacity, of the receiving mind. Very much, we take it, like the experience of the angel mentioned in one of Swedenborg's revelations, who asked a fellow-angel for grapes, and complained that figs were handed to him. I gave them to you, said his companion, as grapes, but you took them as figs.

Since words are only proximate expressions of ideas, forms of representation must be multiplied in order to get a rich and just apprehension of spiritual truth. Hence the common logical methods of clearing up intricate questions by analysis and definitions, are barren or false. The subject matter of mental science and religion can never be included in the fixed forms of dogma. Definitions are only changes of symbol, and, if we take them to be more, will infallibly lead us into error. "The views of language

Digitized by Google

here offered," — says Dr. Bushnell, — "suggest the very great difficulty, if not impossibility, of mental science and religious dogmatism. In all such uses, or attempted uses, the effort is to make language answer a purpose that is against its nature. The winged words are required to serve as beasts of burden; or, what is no better, to forget their poetic life, as messengers of the air, and stand still, fixed upon the ground, as wooden statues of truths. Which, if they seem to do, if, to comfort our studies of dogma, they assume the inert faces we desire, and suffer us to arrange the fixed attitudes of their bodies, yet, as little Memnons touched and made vocal by the light, they will be discoursing still of the free empyrean, disturbing and scattering, by their voices, all the exact meanings we had thought to hold them to, in the nice corporeal order of our science."

The use to which Dr. Bushnell would put these principles is plain. If they are correct, creeds are impertinent, for they cannot be exact. The Scriptures, too, must be interpreted very differently from the popular methods of exegesis, and will be quite another volume if interpreted by the light of his philosophy. The Bible is the expression of God to man, a communication of his truth, his love, his justice and compassion. God has conveyed these to us not abstractly and scientifically, but æsthetically, in the manner of art. They are addressed to us in the language, and under the forms of thought, of different men and separate ages, through history, and poems, and treatises, and the lives of saints, and the great Incarnation. The Bible, from Genesis to the Apocalypse, is a vast poem of salvation through which the Infinite would suggest Himself to the spiritual nature of our race, and of its deepest meaning logic is as unfit a measure as it would be if used to interpret the genius manifested in Macbeth or Lear. "Let me freely confess," — says Dr. B. — "that, when I see the human teacher elaborating a phrase of speech, or a mere dialectic proposition, that is going to tell what God could only show me by the history of ages, and the mystic life and death of Jesus our Lord, I should be deeply shocked by his irreverence, if I were not rather occupied with pity for his infirmity."

And while creeds or dogmatic propositions are so incompetent to convey the deepest truths of the Bible, lan-

Digitized by Google

guage is so flexible that a philosopher may assent to almost any creed that is offered to him. "Perhaps it is on this account that I have never been able to sympathise at all with the abundant protesting of the New England Unitarians against creeds. So far from suffering even the least consciousness of constraint or oppression under any creed, I have been readier to accept as great a number as fell in my way; for when they are subjected to the deepest chemistry of thought, that which descends to the point of relationship between the form of the truth and its interior formless nature, they become, thereupon, so elastic, and run so freely into each other, that one seldom need have any difficulty in accepting as many as are offered him. He may regard them as only a kind of battle-dooring of words, blow answering to blow, while the reality of the play, viz., *exercise*, is the same, whichever side of the room is taken, and whither the stroke is given by the right hand or the left."

We may admit the ground principle of Dr. Bushnell's theory of language without accepting his conclusions. The richest and most comprehensive truths can be only suggested to the mind by words, and the degree of meaning which they bear to us will depend upon the lively sensibility of the spiritual nature, and its endeavor to realise the contents or sweep of the ideas conveyed. But language is amply competent to set before us inconsistent and contending propositions, and to define the difference between theories which are hostile to each other. It seems to us that, throughout the Essay on Language, the author has overlooked the capacity of words *to outline* clearly great departments of truth to the mind, and has made an exaggerated assertion of their incapacity to unfold and drain all the relations and suggestions which a rich moral truth presents to the reason and arouses in the soul.

We are told (page 61,) that even the simplest affirmation pertaining to intellectual life, "*man thinks*," may have a hundred different meanings, since the developement of the thinking faculty may be conceived in five different ways, the characteristics of thought in five different ways, and the spiritual condition of individual men in four ways. Making a desperate effort to be serious, we reply that such an illustration does not prove the inherent ambiguity of lan-

Digitized by Google

guage, but merely the necessary limitations of set propositions. It does not show that words are fluctuating and treacherous as media of expression, but simply that a man cannot say every thing at once. We can conceive the moon under a number of categories. First, as to the method of its creation, whether by chance, or by design; and if the latter, whether according to the nebular hypothesis, or the supposition of a direct creation, or the Whiston theory of cometary disruption. Second, whether or not it be encircled by air, and blessed with water. Third, as to its composition, whether it is rock, or earth and rock, or as some have maintained, an enormous ball of pressed, coagulated grass-tinted curd. Fourth, whether it is inhabited or no; and if yes, is it an ordinary theatre of probationary life, or, as Tupper imagines, the spiritual quarantine and wandering hell for the guilty of our globe. Now we venture to say that the statement, *the moon is round*, is not at all indefinite or delusive because it does not include the history and anatomy of that interesting orb. We do not see, indeed, why Dr. Bushnell did not extend indefinitely the possibilities of meaning in the phrase *man thinks*, instead of limiting it to one hundred. For, besides the conditions of conceiving man which he has enumerated, may be mentioned the categories of race, color, size, symmetry, age, temper, station, &c., which, as nothing is affirmed of them in the general term *man*, increase the obscurity of the formula amazingly. Dr. Bushnell has indicated quite precisely the various senses which the phrase *man thinks* may suggest; and if a writer, wishing to narrow his subject and predicate, should choose to state either one of those limitations as the precise view of man and thought which he adopts, of course Dr. B. will admit that his language is accurate, definite, and trustworthy. And so his own illustration, instead of *disproving*, really *proves* that language can be a clear medium of thought. It occurs to us, moreover, as a point worthy of notice in this connection, that there is one proposition, which even the law of combinations cannot construct out of the fluid or elastic phrase we are considering. No dissection, can turn the statement *man thinks* into the formula *man does not think*. Those two little "vocal Memnons," even if a flood

Digitized by Google

of light be poured upon their lips, will not dare to chant a negative in their most mystic songs.

A writer who attempts to be clear upon this point perils his reputation with Dr. Bushnell; for he tells us frankly that he never met a clear writer who was able to send him forward an inch, and who was not superficial. But the truth about this subject is not so recondite as to require shadowy expression, and therefore we will venture to contend that a creed, or dogmatic propositions, although they certainly cannot imprison the spirit of Christ, may be empty of all error, and may map the peculiar features of Christianity, as an individual system of truth, with perfect precision. Just as a chart, which cannot convey an adequate idea of the scenery of Massachusetts, may accurately outline its boundaries, fix its latitude, represent its geological structure, define to the eye the course of its rivers and mountain ranges, and distinguish it sharply from the states that lie around. Doubtless the most vivid and poetic language cannot convey the whole depth and wide relations of the truth "God is Love." It must be interpreted by the affections; its wealthy spiritual contents can only be suggested by analogies from the quality and play of the purest and wisest love in an earthly parent; and so the sense of the phrase shrinks or widens according to the depth of feeling and present glow of heart in the reader's breast. Still the statement "God is Love," is definite enough to establish that God is not mere intellect, that God is not selfish, that God is not cruel. It furnishes a positive formula which, to be sure, we are to vivify, and the whole sweep of which we are to explore, but none the less on this account does it oppose a hostile supposition, exclude from the Divine nature all base and brutal passions, and state something fundamentally and firmly true.

So language may not be able to enfold worthy annunciations of God's goodness in the gift of Christ. But words can clearly enough define whether Christ was coeternal with the Father; or whether he was created before the foundation of the world; or whether he was a human being miraculously endowed with power and insight, whose existence began on earth; or whether he was simply the best man, without superior physical gifts, whose faculties were in fortunate equilibrium, and whose history

Digitized by Google

in the Gospels is vitiated by myths. In the very next paragraph to that in which he speaks of the easy resolution of any creed into acceptable truth, Dr. Bushnell complains of the phrase, "the same in substance," in Trinitarian formulas, and says "how many are there, even of our theologians, to whom it will now seem a heresy *to say this with a meaning*." And he thinks the clause "equal in power and glory" scarcely less supportable when a view of Trinity is offered "*which gives the terms an earnest and real significance*." If, in spite of the flexibility of language, these passages are so stubborn, we hardly dare to imagine the effervesence that must ensue before the "deepest chemistry of thought" can harmoniously mix the doctrines of total depravity, and the primitive sinlessness of our nature; nor the stretch of terms which will force the "elastic" dogma of Vicarious Atonement to coalese with Humanitarianism; and even when these run into each other, it certainly is painful to conceive the mental perspiration which must attend the "exercise" at battle-door, before the ultimate reconciliation of our race, and the eternal damnation of the guilty can be battered to equivalence.

We object to the imposition of detailed creeds as bonds of union and bases of fellowship as strongly as Dr. Bushnell, but not for the reasons which, in the Chapter on Language, he esteems so forcible. We believe that the opinions of any man concerning Christianity can be stated accurately to others, and that the leading and distinguishing doctrines of the gospel can be shed upon the intellect of all men, by an artist in language, through achromatic words. There is little difficulty, if the mind is honest and will take the trouble, in determining the exact meaning which the framers of an article of faith enveloped in their phrases; and these Discourses sufficiently prove that the cardinal propositions of Orthodoxy, as generally interpreted, convey a most intelligible and objectionable sense. In the controversy about dogmatic formulas, the points to be decided are, How minute and extended shall be the verbal tests we frame? Do not the broad acknowledgement of Christ's providential mission, and the endeavor to be subject to his spirit, constitute a Christian man? If so, is it best that the Church should be divided into inhospitable clans according to concurrence of opinion, and coincidence

Digitized by Google

of analysis; or would it not be better to abate a little the importance of strict mental consent, and propose a great practical work as the attractive bond of disciples, which, possibly, might soon carry the intellect out of an excessively speculative mood, and allay the fever of partisanship, and by inducing unity of spirit, prove to be the bond of wise and stable peace? These points remain for discussion, even if the arguments against creeds from the indefiniteness of language should be found of trifling worth.

We assent most cordially to the views, so freely and admirably expressed in many pages of Dr. Bushnell's volume, respecting the interpretation of the Scriptures. Nothing has contributed to wither theology more than the textual method of interpretation, which assumes that all parts of the Bible are on the same level of authority, that every book was composed in the same mood of feeling, and that a mosaic of passages, suggested by the law of verbal association, must express the living spirit of the gospel. It is hardly necessary for us to enlarge upon the defects of this method, after the perspicuous treatment of the subject in the celebrated letter from Germany which appeared in the number of this Review for April 1847, from a correspondent, whose inexplicable silence since then we most deeply regret. But we are convinced that Dr. Bushnell, in deriving his laws of exegesis from his theory of language, gives them an inadequate and wrong foundation. It is not necessary to believe in the faithlessness of words, in order to see that a simile in Job or Isaiah, and a prayer gushing from the heart of David, and rhythmically measured by his harp while flying from his persecutors, or covered by the caves of Ziph, must be interpreted by other measures of sense than those applied to the ten commandments, the ethical passages of James, and the arguments of Paul. Granting that the Bible is, letter for letter, the word of God, still one part is inspired poetry, another part inspired philosophy, and another inspired law, and the proper way to define the sense of these various utterances of inspiration, must be determined by the literary form it bears, just as if it were not inspired at all.

We regret that no hint is given anywhere in his Discourses of our author's view of the relative inspiration of

Digitized by Google

the parts of Scripture. Many of his sentences imply that the conflict of religious statements in different parts of the Bible are wholly owing to license of expression. But if we take the ground, which more timid men than Dr. Bushnell have long occupied, that the inspiration of the Bible has various degrees, corresponding to the necessities and culture of advancing stages of thought, we can well understand why the conceptions of God and religion in the Mosaic, prophetic, and Christian eras, may conflict, without impeaching either the capacity of language, or the honor of Revelation. And in that case, not only would the barbarous textual method of interpretation be abandoned, but we should cease to look upon hostile passages of Scripture, as "cross views" of the same rich field, and should perceive that, in the Old Testament, they were accommodated publications from different grades of spiritual progress. When we see how much harm is done to religion from failure to recognize and realize this simple fact, we are deeply anxious to see it assumed as an axiom in theology, and regret that Dr. Bushnell should have neglected or forgotten to apply it as the explanation of most of the perplexities of the Bible.

But we pass from these introductory matters to the Discourse on the Trinity. There is provoking obscurity in the title of this address — "The *Divinity* of Christ." The author does not seem to recognize any difference between the Orthodox view of Christ's nature, and Humanitarianism. The discourse is preceded by ten arguments for the *Divinity* of Christ, either founded on, or cognate to, Scriptural passages, as opposed to his simple humanity. The fact of the pre-existence, the miraculous birth, the bold statements of an incarnation, and of the mysterious contents of Christ's person, the teachings of Jesus concerning the relations between himself and the Father, and the formulas of baptism, crush, as we are told, the humanitarian estimate of Jesus' nature. His assumptions of sinlessness, and of an office so wonderful, nay, even his declarations that God is greater than himself, are offensive if he is only a commissioned man. Let it be so. But has Dr. Bushnell never heard of Arianism? The hypothesis of Jesus' pre-existence as a created being subordinate to God, but higher than man, meets the demands of each and all of his

Digitized by Google

ten arguments. When we look into some of these scriptural proofs, it is hard enough to allow Dr. Bushnell's sincerity without impeaching his reason; but the task is still more perplexing when we find him deliberately ignoring an explanation which it would be much harder for him to meet, and which would be offered by the majority of liberal Christians.

We are told in the introductory pages of this volume, that the author does not seem to himself to assert any thing but "the real moment of all Orthodox formulas unabridged." But how his conception of the Trinity can be considered Orthodox, even by the most hospitable criticism, we cannot understand, except it be by reason of the truth that hostile theories, in the treatment of a master-hand, can be made to "run freely into each other." The estimate of the Trinity which he attributes to "a very large portion of the Christian teachers, and the general mass of disciples," is that of three real living persons in the interior nature of God; that is, three consciousnesses, wills, hearts, and understandings. The absurdity of this view he quickly demonstrates. The only unity possible, under this conception, as we are told, is a social unity; the Godhead is a celestial tri-theocracy; the subordination of the Son cannot in any sense be held; and if men insist on the verbal profession of one person, "they only confuse their understanding, and call their confusion faith." If, however, the three persons are three sets of attributes inhering in a common substance, then the three intelligences come to their unity in a virtually inorganic ground, which, although it makes a monster of the Deity, leaves no unity at all. But, if the substance supposed be itselfof a vital quality,—a Life, then we have only more difficulties on hand, and not fewer; viz., "to conceive a Living Person having in Himself, first the attributes of a person, and secondly three more persons who are attributes in the second degree,—that is, attributes of attributes." And furthermore, Dr. Bushnell acutely suggests the difficulty of conceiving "how attributes can be real enough to make persons, and not real enough to make substances." If it is protested by some that, by persons, they only mean a "threefold distinction," Dr. Bushnell shows them that they mean nothing, for "they always reason of the three, not as somewhats and

Digitized by Google

distinctions, but as metaphysical and real persons." If the three are compared in their union to the soul, the life-principle, and the body united in one person called a man, — "the illustration only shows how God may be one and not three; for the life and the body are not persons." Therefore, "if any one will say that he believes in three metaphysical or essential persons in the being of God, there is no argument that can set him in a more unsatisfactory position, whether intellectually or practically, than he takes himself. Or if any one endeavors to relieve his position, by declaring that he only means *distinctions* by the word *persons*, he only flies into darkness and negation for his comfort, and there he may safely be left."

Having given this *singular* proof of the incompetency of language, and his lack of confidence in logic, Dr. Bushnell takes up for himself the question, How can the Deity of Christ consist with the proper unity of God? God the absolute, as existing in himself, completely transcends the comprehension of our reason. Every form of life and thought which we are able to conceive, is negatived in the very idea of a Being Infinite, self-centred, formless, passionless, and omniscient. When he is revealed, it can be only through finite media. Now the Trinity results of necessity from the *Revelation* of God to man; since "He could not be efficiently or sufficiently revealed to us without evolving a trinity of persons, such as we meet in the Scriptures. These persons or personalities are the *dramatis personæ* of Revelation, and their reality is measured by what of the Infinite they convey in these finite forms." God contains within himself a creative imagination, or capacity of self expression, which is called the Logos; and by means of this he pours or represents himself in all the finite forms of being. The human person, taken as a mere structure, is the most noble illustration of His wisdom, and has some inherent, *a priori*, relation to His nature, so that it can be made the truest, most expressive finite type of Him. If men had continued in a pure upright character, our whole race would have been a visible revelation of the truth and beauty of God. But as it has been so defaced by sin, that the beauty of goodness lives and smiles no more, "God will reclaim this last type of Himself, possess it with his own life and feeling, and

Digitized by Google

through that, live Himself into the acquaintance and biographic history of the world." This is the Christ of the Bible, the word made flesh, the Son of God.

Prior to the advent of Christ, there is no appearance of Trinity in the Revelations of Deity. But a finite thing or person, without a relative in the finite, is absurd, for relative terms and forces are necessary to lead us to the Absolute, and therefore to support or comfort Christ's attitude, and to make it intelligible, "he calls out into thought, as residing in heaven, and possessing celestial exaltation, the Father, who is, in fact, the Absolute Being brought into a lively, conversible, definite (therefore finite) form of personal conception, and sets himself on terms of relationship with him at the other pole." But in order to the full and complete apprehension of God, a third personality, the Holy Spirit, needs to appear. We want to conceive God "as in *act* with us, working in us, under the conditions of time and progression, spiritual results of quickening, deliverance, and purification from evil. Accordingly, the natural image, *spirit*, that is, breath, is taken up and clothed with a personal activity. . . . . And thus the Absolute Being, of whom we could predicate no motion or proceeding, becomes a vital presence residing ever with us, to work in us all that we [illegible] and strengthen us to that which none but a divine power can support." Dr. Bushnell plainly enough suggests his disbelief in any original distinctions in the Divine nature corresponding to this Trinity of forms; he calls it "an Instrumental Trinity, and the persons Instrumental persons." "They dramatise and bring forth into life about us that Infinite one, who, to our mere thought, were no better than Brama sleeping on eternity and the stars." "Through their Divine Activities, heaven is married to earth, and earth to heaven, and the Absolute Jehovah, whose nature we before could nowise comprehend, but dimly know, and yet more dimly feel, has, by these outgoings, waked up in us, all living images of His love and power, and presence, and set the whole world in a glow."

There is some danger that this slippery language cannot be held long enough to be examined; and certainly weighty objections crowd through the mind against such a scheme of Trinity faster than we can state them. Since

Digitized by Google

Dr. Bushnell has preferred to get an *a priori* philosophical basis for his theory, instead of endeavoring to harmonise it with the Bible, we think he should have enlarged a little upon the position that the Trinity results, *of necessity*, from the Revelation of God to man. We cannot see how the idea Revelation implies *threeness* any more than *twoness* or *fourness* in the forms of manifestation. We presume that Dr. Bushnell is acquainted with the Old Testament. Did the Jews enjoy a Revelation from God? Was it efficient enough to foster a healthy piety? When an argument is thoroughly fatal to a position, as the acknowledged Unitarianism of the Jews is to the philosophical principle which Dr. Bushnell has advanced, we may leave it, without further urging, to exert its native force. If, however, it is asserted that God cannot be *efficiently* or *sufficiently* revealed except through the Trinity, still we ask what necessary connection is there between the efficiency of a Revelation, and a triple channel? and why would a quintuple manifestation be less sufficient than a Triune one?

And again, we do not see why, to meet the problem which Dr. Bushnell proposes in the Discourse on the Trinity, the *Deity* of Christ is necessary at all. Were it not for the fall, our race, he tells us, would have been a visible revelation of the truth and beauty of God. It was to give an unblemished manifestation of truth and the beauty of goodness that the incarnation in a human form, the noblest of all forms, was determined. But to answer this need, was any thing further necessary than the appearance of a being as pure and holy as Adam would have been, if he had not polluted the once transparent vase of Deity? If a visible revelation of Divine truth and beauty was the great thing to be effected, it is really difficult to understand why a *perfect man*, four thousand years after the creation, could not shed it upon a fallen world as completely as a perfect man could have done amid a society that had never sinned. "God will reclaim the last type of himself," says Dr. Bushnell. Is not the type *reclaimed*, if it is restored to its proper purity? Does the miraculous re-clamation make it God, any more than the miraculous creation of Adam, as a sinless being, must have made him God? And if any thing more was done than to fill a human form with an appropriate and predestined moral per-

Digitized by Google

fection, God does not "*reclaim* the *last* type of himself," but create a new and higher one.

It is impossible to understand, either, why, if there was need for the Trinity which Dr. Bushnell expounds, the manifestations are limited to three. There is no ground in the Divine nature for these precise forms of Revelation — Father, Son, and Spirit. They are dramatical expressions of the offices of the Absolute, acting relatively toward each other, that we may ascend into the liveliest, fullest realization of God. Why then, on the philosophical principles that underlie his address, do we not need a dramatic presentation of God the Creator, God the Sustainer, God the Universal Providence? "Through a certain feeling of multiplicity and vagueness, we are able," our author tells us, "to realise God dynamically, as we could through no conception of Him." The realization, then, would be more complete if the forms were more varied. There is no fear of exhausting the offices of the Infinite, no danger of the soul becoming too "warm" in its sublimation. And therefore, the fuller we make the sky of "Divine Activities," the more awake and real will Brama seem. Nay, since the Grecian sky was more lively with these activities, must we not feel that the Greek mythology was superior in form to the Christian, and mourn that such admirable scenic appointments of Revelation should have been wasted on a frivolous paganism.

The reader has doubtless anticipated all that we would say concerning the objective *reality* of the Trinity we are considering. It is the peculiarity of this "Instrumental" theory, that it makes the Father equally phenomenal with the Spirit, not standing as the designation of the Godhead, but as one of the finite forms of Divine representation. In respect of the real existence of the Father and Spirit, Dr. Bushnell's language is like loose quicksilver; if you press it, it runs away, breaks into a thousand forms. "They are three," he tells us, "simply as related to our finite apprehension." But are they three *words*, or three *Beings?* Our finite apprehension is capable of knowing that. At one time, we are warned against investigating *their* interior nature, as though they are living entities; while, from other passages, it would not seem that they have even the reality of figured porcelain-shades, through

Digitized by Google

which the light is sometimes revealed "dramatically" to the eye. Christ, "to comfort his attitude and in order to exalt and deify what he reveals," "*calls out into thought* the Father" "who *is conceived* to reside in the heavens, as he himself is seen to walk upon the earth." "The natural image *Spirit*, is taken up and clothed with a personal activity." This is all the direct description we get about the origin and substance of the Trinity. Does the word, Father, signify to Dr. Bushnell any thing more than the spiritual-relation which the Deity sustains to his children? If it does not, he "palters with us in a double sense;" if it does, he might have chosen some other theme for an exhibition of Talleyrand's doctrine of the purposes of speech. Dr. Bushnell thinks that as they appear in Scripture under the grammatic forms — *I*, *Thou*, *We*, *He*, *They*, we do not take very great license in calling them *three* persons. But his Orthodox friends might suggest to him that the occurrence of these pronouns is not so strong a reason why he should use them, as it is that his whole theory is false. When he was reasoning against the common doctrine of the Trinity, Dr. B. informed us that "the very idea of a person is that of an essential, incommunicable monad, bounded by consciousness and vitalized by self-active will." There is very good cause therefore why he should abstain from applying the word, *persons*, to his Trinity, for he informs us "whatsoever may be true of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, it certainly is not true that they are three distinct consciousnesses, wills and understandings." What, then, are they? They do not have their ground directly even in an "inorganic" Divine nature; they are all finite; they are "called out into thought;" they have no separate intellect or wills. There is something sublime in the affront which the old enigma of the Trinity has for ages put upon human reason. The imagination is charmed by the recollection that it is the venerable marriage-bond of paganism and the gospel, and the treaty of peace between the pupils of Christ and Plato. For centuries it has nobly stood its ground against the assaults of logic, because it has been made the exaggerated representative of the idea, and been associated in the minds of men with the truth, that there is mystery in religion which outruns the reach and baulks the methods of critical analysis. But the "*In-*

Digitized by Google

strumental" substitute here offered has dispossessed itself of this fascination, and can suggest no element of such charm. It does not defy, but eludes, our reason. It dares not proscribe, and so it deprecates, inquiry. Its filmy shapes have been evoked to veil the void which a bold dialectics had left in the mythology of the Church; and then the anxious conjuror would guard them not from the blade, but from the breath, of logic. As a theory, it smells of the study; it suggests deliberate sorcery; there is no robust mystery in it; "it is sicklied o'er with the pale cast of thought."

The central revelation in the Gospels, apart from the life of Jesus, is that God is the Father. Plainly enough the Saviour endeavored to kindle the affections and vivify the conscience of his listeners by flooding the atmosphere of life with the light and warmth of that great fact. Let any one compare the hypothesis which makes "the Father" a relative term suggested by the "Son," called out "to comfort his attitude," and assist the play of Revelation, with the doctrine that the absolute God is the Father, and that the central quality of his being is Love, and then let him try to read the discourses of Jesus by the light of the "Instrumental" theory, and, despite the rhetoric of Dr. Bushnell, he will see the coldness of his system in itself, and its consummate weakness as an interpretation of the gospel. For ought that can be discovered in the contents of two terms in this Trinity,—the Father, and the Holy Ghost,—the shoreless gulf of cold, bright mist, which is the only conception we can form of the Absolute, remains still uncolored before the human affections and impenetrable to the mind; and the Paternity which, in Christianity, like the luminous vesture of the sun, wraps the dark substance of the Deity, is dissipated perhaps into a vapory impersonal form, or, it may be a feeble hue impinged upon the prismatic medium of thought.

The only reality in the "Instrumental" Trinity, is Christ; and, according to Dr. Bushnell's hypothesis of his existence, even Jesus, in and for himself, had no more personality than a plant or tree. In defending the possibility and sufficiency of an Incarnation, Dr. B. uses analogies drawn from the presence of God in natural objects, and the typical character of the material world. "God may act",

Digitized by Google

says he, "a human personality, without being measured by it, as well as to shine through a finite thing or a world without being measured by that." Certainly he can; and as certainly two things result: First, the personality thus acted would be God *in just* the *same sense* as a star or flower is God; and then what becomes of the "Deity of Christ" which we are desired to believe is proved? and second, a human personality which God acts, is not a human personality; for "the very idea of a person is that of an incommunicable monad, bounded by consciousness, and vitalized by self will."

Dr. Bushnell despatches the Trinitarian hypothesis of two natures in Christ in few words. He shows that it is inconsistent with the plain language of Scripture, that it accounts for nothing, that it creates greater difficulties than it solves, and that it is a virtual denial of an incarnation, or manifested union between God and man. He then approaches the Unitarian objection, that since Christ obeyed, worshipped, suffered, his internal nature was evidently under a limitation, which proves that he was not God. In reply to this, we are told that to *name* God, or to *speak* of Him, is to create the same difficulty, that is, to bring Him under limitations. This is no answer; for the question is, not whether to name God, or to think of Him, brings Him, to our mind, under limitations, but whether *to be* God is consistent with limitations. And continuing his reply, Dr. Bushnell insists that Christ came to express the feeling, love, and placableness of the Absolute Being. The reality of Christ is what he expresses of God, not what he is in his physical conditions. When we see him under the conditions of growth, obedience, worship, suffering, we have nothing to do but to ask what is here expressed, and as long as we do that, we shall have no difficulty. To be more curious, to insist on understanding the composition of Christ's person, "is to puzzle ourselves with the vehicle, and rob ourselves of the grace it brings." If God uses Christ as the medium of His expression to our race, "we see at once that here is a matter which is not psychologically or physiologically investigable, because it does not lie within the categories of ordinary, natural humanity."

Now whether this principle be true or not, certainly the

Digitized by Google

method and circumstances of its presentation are most singular. One theory of Christ's nature meets with the objection that it cannot harmonize with the plain implications of Scripture, and is inconsistent and absurd. Another theory, which is supported by the Biblical passages that are so repugnant to the refuted scheme, and which affirms the personality of Jesus in an intelligible sense, is met with the rebuff that the whole subject lies without the categories of ordinary humanity, and is not investigable. We do not complain that a theologian declines to avow Unitarianism; but in a well digested treatise, we have a right to complain of arbitrary argument. It is hardly proper for an uninspired man to use, with equal confidence and satisfaction, the disproof of logic against one opponent, and reproof for logic against another. It is a fair and frank position that the contents of Christ's person defy analysis; but if they are not investigable, how do we know that the hypothesis of two natures is not correct? What right has a debater to bring any argument against it, except the principle that investigation is impertinent, and discovery impossible? The fact that an impenetrable fog hangs over a landscape is a very good cause why a man may be laughed at for trying to look into it, but it is a very poor reason why another should, at the same time, be lectured for not sketching an acurate view. There is, really, admirable wit in the rebuke which Dr. Bushnell administers to those who are anxious to try their science on the interior elements of Christ's person, in the hope to detect its composition. "It is," says he, "as if Abraham, after he had entertained as a guest the Jehovah angel, instead of receiving his message, had fallen to inquiring into the digestive process of the angel.— Let alone thy folly and thy shallow curiosity, O Abraham! we should say; hear the Lord speak to thee; what he commands thee, do, what he promises, believe! Suspend thy raw guesses at his nature, and take his message!" This would, truly, be wise advice to Abraham when the guest first came; but if the patriarch had been rash and uncivil enough to watch the visitant so narrowly as to become satisfied that he did not possess two livers, and two sets of lungs, it would certainly be queer, if he should himself warn a companion against concluding that the angel had one very natural liver, and breathed very much like ordinary men.

Digitized by Google

It is a most difficult matter to get any conception of Dr. Bushnell's view of Christ, which can be proposed either for criticism or assent. He will not tolerate the notion of two natures in Christ. He speaks of God "inhabiting a vehicle," "assuming the human," "acting a human personality;" and yet in a former part of the discourse the question is asked, as though it were a triumphant refutation of Unitarianism — "as to the unreal, superhuman-human, that is, the human acted wholly by the divine, so as to have no action of its own, save in pretence, what is it to us but a mockery?" When a Unitarian hints that Christ appears to be a finite person, he is informed "it no more follows that a human body measures God, when revealed through it, than that a star, a tree, or an insect measures Him, when He is revealed through that." Just as we are about to rely upon the plain meaning of this analogy, the passage from the Cambridge Address swims into our memory — "it is not that God simply makes a theophany or show of Himself through a human body, for the mere accident of his connection with a human body, taken as type, would signify nothing to our human feeling." If a writer can justify himself in making such statements and such distinctions, upon a subject which defies analysis, a reader ought not to be thought too presumptuous who desires to know the ground on which the distinctions are made; and, after such distinctions have been drawn, to close debate with the assurance that the subject is not investigable, hardly excites sufficient reverence for the divine mystery, to smother our annoyance at the human dogmatism through which it is revealed.

Dr. Bushnell insists strongly that Christ's life and person must be taken solely as an *expression* of God's feeling and love. We must not seek to go behind this truth. "Christ is not here for the sake of something accomplished in his metaphysical or psychological interior, but for that which appears and is outwardly signified in his life." If this is the case, all discussion between Unitarians and Trinitarians should cease at once. Least of all should Dr. Bushnell show any partialities in the dispute. Both parties see and receive *what* Christ expresses; why waste argument and temper in a controversy about *how* it is expressed? If the only important matter is to recognise and

Digitized by Google

feel the light and heat as tokens of God's goodness, why occupy the day in strife about the size of the sun, and the origin of its heat? The facts expressed are the same — the colors of Christ's life, and the principles of his doctrine — whether he was God acting under human limitations, or a miraculously endowed and commissioned man. No one will say that the hypothesis of Christ's *Deity*, is indispensable as an explanation of what Christ spoke and acted. It is not a truth which is reached inductively from the phenomena of his career. A *divine commission* sufficiently accounts for all the works recorded in the Gospels. And, therefore, if his character is to be viewed as an expression of the Almighty's feeling, it should not seem that the scale of his person is, practically, a matter of the slightest consequence. "God certainly is able," we are told, "to assume the human, to become incarnate in it so far as to express His union to it, and set Himself as Eternal Life in historic and real connection with it." Of course He is; but if it cannot be shown that the manifestation of God transcends, at any point, the possibilities of a perfect human experience; if it be essential that the incarnation "must act the human perfectly;" why does not a perfect human being, chosen for the purpose, answer all the necessities of the case? The type cannot be more than full; it does not hold what is *not* poured into it; and a perfect human being whom God should set before men as the suggestive type of his moral qualities, would do all for us which is done by the divinely acted personality presented by the "Instrumental" theory, which contradicts every law of Absolute and finite being.

But Dr. Bushnell will not adhere to the principle that Christ's life is valuable only for what it expresses. He insists on mixing the *how* with the *what*. The Unitarian doctrine that Christ is, in some very special and supernatural sense, a manifestation of God, gives us, he says, "a man without a man, a perfect human character which is not unfolded by the human." And, withal, it is a doctrine "that has too little body and shape *to have any important resulting use*." Then the expression of God, after all, is a trifling matter until we connect it with *one* theory of his inward structure! We may figure, he tells us, a certain "tribe of sophisters, as a man standing before that

Digitized by Google

most beautiful and wondrous work of art, the 'Beatified Spirit' of Guido, and there commencing a quarrel with the artist, that he should be so absurd as to think of making a beatified spirit out of mere linseed, ochres, and oxides!" Dr. Bushnell, we fear, if he carries the same principles into art which he applies to theology, would assure the painter that his "Beatified Spirit" could not, as a work of art, have any spiritual use, because the flax was an earthly production, and the canvas on which the painting glows was woven in a mere human loom.

The examination we have made of some features of this "Instrumental" theory plainly suggests that the radical vice of Dr. Bushnell's system is one which is seldom apparent in theology. Most thinkers make too little account of the spirit of Christ's character in their estimate of Christianity, and view the gospel as a publication of religious propositions and spiritual laws. But he seems to affix very slight value to the revelation of God given through what Christ *has told* us of Him, — the broad formulas that shed so much light upon the soul; and virtually places the whole power and efficacy of revelation in the personal dignity of the agent through whom the Deity conveys His message. Indeed, it should seem that the message which Jesus brings is not worth speaking of; for the tone of Dr. Bushnell's language everywhere indicates, that if the scale of the Saviour's nature be reduced, the efficiency of the gospel is paralyzed. A *sub*-carnation, no matter what comprehensive truths might be disclosed through it, is of little worth to him; an *in*-carnation only can bring God to the knowledge of the soul.

Now it is evident, whatever relative importance is ascribed to the life of Jesus, that much of the power of revelation *must* depend, and *does* depend, on the authoritative instructions which the divine missionary brings. He comes to teach by words, as well as by a symbolic life. No incarnation can represent those attributes of the Deity of which the mind needs to be assured, that it may be saved from corrupting errors, and find stable rest. The spirituality, the omnipresence, the fathomless wisdom, and ceaseless providence, of the Almighty, cannot be symbolized in a human form; they must be stated in words, and enforced by the authority of the revelator's lips. And this is the

Digitized by Google

simple secret of Christ's mission, which it seems to us Dr. Bushnell's brilliant efforts to save his Orthodoxy have obscured to his own mind, — that it was to communicate by his words the clearest and amplest knowledge of the Divine nature which it is possible for humanity to apprehend; and, through the natural and self-acquired symmetry of his character, and the beneficent use of his superhuman gifts, to furnish a winning model of religious excellence, and to supply the world with a set of colors which can be cast upon the Divine nature, and make it glow with an attractive radiance to the affections of mankind.

Let us pass, now, to our author's view of the Atonement, conveyed in the Cambridge Address. Dr. Bushnell distributes the Orthodox theories of the Atonement into two classes. One party consider the death of Christ as a literal substitution of evil endured, for evil that was to be endured. The other party view it as an expression of God's abhorrence to sin, made through the suffering of one, in place of the same expression that was to be made by the suffering of many. Both these estimates are spitted upon his racy logic, and thrown aside. The object of Christ's mission, according to his view, is, to express God's character and bring the Eternal Life into visible evidence and social relation; to sanctify and set in honor, before mankind, the broken law of God; and to bring God as a renovating power into union with human nature; and all this "without any imposition or endurance of evil, in the penal form of evil, any suffering or pain which is undertaken for effect, as being a direct exhibition of God's justice or judicial abhorrence of sin."

Dr. Bushnell finds in the New Testament two classes of texts referring to the mission of Jesus, to both of which a catholic, comprehensive theory must do full justice. The first class includes passages like these — "to this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, to bear witness to the truth;" "I am the way, the truth, and the life;" "I am the light of the world," &c. Such declarations, and they occur generally in the Gospels, announce the work of Christ *in its ends*, and view it as a power related to its ends. These passages Dr. Bushnell generalizes into the subjective, speculative view of Jesus' office. But there are, also, in the writings especially of

Digitized by Google

the apostles, continual references to the Saviour as a propitiation, a sacrifice, as bearing our sins, bearing the curse for us, and obtaining remission by his blood. From these he constructs what he calls the *Altar Form* of Christianity for the soul, that is, an objective, ritualistic view, which sets Christ forth to faith, instead of philosophy, and without which he would not be the power intended, or work the ends appointed. The gospel, in his view, includes, and was intended to include, both these phases; and we cannot lose sight of either without injuring the symmetry and perilling the efficiency of Christianity as the means of salvation.

In developing the subjective side of the Saviour's office, that which it is in itself, as a power, the tone of Dr. Bushnell's pages is wholly Unitarian. We cannot forbear expressing our admiration of the boldness, the vigor, reach and condensation of thought, the freshness of statement, and clearness of exposition, that characterize the stream of rich and earnest eloquence which flows from the 203d to the 218th pages of this Discourse. If for nothing else, it would deserve to be studied as an instance of most original phraseology upon a hackneyed theme. It is an oasis in the sands of Orthodox divinity; never have we met so glowing and luminous an exposition of the Saviour's influence upon our race, from the pen or lips of any disciple of Liberal Christianity. It bears testimony to the patience with which he has studied the elements of the Redeemer's glory, the clearness with which he sees the secret of its power, and the reverent enthusiasm which the experience and contemplation of its all-subduing energy have kindled in his heart.

Rejecting, as we have seen, all vicarious views of Jesus' mission, Dr. Bushnell regards Christianity as a power moving upon man through the æsthetic department of his nature to regenerate his degraded perception of excellence. The life of Christ, considered only as a perfect being or character, has of necessity an organic power, and is "an embodiment of a spirit and of ideas, which are sufficient of themselves to change the destinies of the race, and even their capabilities of good." It is the Eternal Life incarnated in an evil history, meeting an alienated and averted race. It comes to revive in the sinner the consciousness

Digitized by Google

of himself; to manifest immortality, and show him the grandeur of his eternity, and the tremendous import of his sin; to let God invade the corrupted senses and withered feelings of our nature; and to break the organic force and corporate authority of evil, by establishing in the world's bosom a new society of life that shall finally renew the world.

We have never been able to account for the sway of the prevalent Orthodox hypothesis, that the government of God is divided into two departments,—a system of law, and a scheme of grace. Every body knows how rigidly it is maintained that, so long as a system of law prevails, God's justice cannot suffer Him to pardon a single penitent sinner; every crime deserves eternal punishment, and only entire sinlessness can save the world from ruin. But in Christianity, it is said, the penal system is averted; a way is opened through the satisfactory suffering of Jesus for the efficacy of penitence; and God can consistently receive the sinner to his favor. This theory of two conflicting methods of Divine administration, is generally supported, we are aware, by passages from the books of Romans and Hebrews; but if those passages were trebly stronger than they are, it should seem that any theologian must feel the necessity of a different interpretation of them, when he cannot help seeing that nothing of the kind is hinted in the whole of the Old Testament, when he finds that volume studded with promises of pardon, and when he sees no reference to such a change in all the Saviour's teachings. Dr. Bushnell endeavors to take a middle course between the Orthodox view, and the doctrine that God, of His simple goodness and paternity, can and will forgive every truly penitent sinner. He thinks that in order *to make men penitent*, and so to want forgiveness, to keep the world alive to its eternal integrity, verity, and sanctity, it was needful that Christ, in his life and sufferings, should consecrate or reconsecrate the desecrated law of God, and give it a more exact and imminent authority than it had before. It has always seemed perfectly plain to us, in thinking of this subject, that so far from a legal system being averted or compromised by Christianity, a far more stringent and searching law was introduced. And we find Dr. Bushnell urging the same point in his Cam-

Digitized by Google

bridge Address: "There is no chapter," says he, "in the Old Testament, where the law of God is held up in such terms of rigor and exactness, as it is in the sermon on the mount, the very first exposition that Christ made of his mission." And not only by his teachings, but by his "obedience," by "expense and painstaking," and by "the offering of his life as a sacred contribution," does he honor, fortify, and sanctify the law of God. In the last three ways, Dr. B. argues at some length that Christ fulfills the office of a sacrifice, and accomplishes those types in the Jewish ritual which had a forelooking to the gospel.

Now we cannot make this elaborated doctrine that Christ establishes the law by these three features of his career, look like any thing else than a made point, an arbitrary impressment of the terms of Orthodoxy into the service of a theory where they must be unnatural and exotic. It tortures what is only an indispensable condition of Jesus' experience, into one of the grand ends of his career. Dr. Bushnell discards every notion of penal suffering, or vindictive chastisement, from the sorrows of the Saviour. He will not allow that any suffering was imposed, or volunteered, merely for the sake of its manifestation; for, in that case, he says it would be valueless and repulsive. It was all incidental to the work which Jesus would achieve. The great aim of Christ, then, was to live a perfect life, and thus introduce the renovating power of goodness into humanity. The essence of goodness is always the same; but the form of its manifestation is always determined by circumstances that surround the soul. The providential discipline, which was exercised over the Saviour, compelled his virtue to assume the form of patience, charity, meekness, trust, resignation. But his goodness was not a reconsecration of a broken law, in the common theological sense, for a special economic purpose, any more than every great exhibition of integrity under trial is a special fortification of God's slighted law. Jesus' character was a most effective revelation of a *higher* law, the glowing exhibition of a perfect ideal. The essence of the revelation made was the spiritual principles, — faith, trust, filial love, devout submission, which are appropriate to every phase of our mortal lot, which, so far as the Saviour's perfection is concerned, might have been exhibited in a thousand other

Digitized by Google

ways, but which shone more impressively upon the world through the peculiar medium of his fortunes. Will Dr. Bushnell say that the perfect goodness of Christ, supposing him not to have been persecuted or molested, would have sanctified the law in any other sense than revealing it, implies? If not, then we cannot say that the hardships of his lot sanctified the law. They only gave a different tinge to his goodness. They furnished a peculiar medium for the transmission to us of his pure light. We cannot say that Jesus came to reveal *and* consecrate the Divine law by his perfect life, as though an important distinction is conveyed by using those two terms. He came to interpret, enforce, and vivify the law, by the clearest revelation which could be made. The most subtile analysis cannot detect any other fact in the case. Perfect spiritual laws cannot be *vindicated* by living in harmony with them; all we can say is that, in this way, their excellence is made known. It might as properly be contended that, by breathing deep when he ascended the Mount of Olives, or by asking for water at the well of Sychar, or by sleeping when he was weary, Jesus honored and fortified the laws of physiology, as that his perfect moral obedience consecrated the laws of spiritual life.

It may be thought that we are hypercritical upon this point; but Dr. Bushnell makes it uphold another doctrine which it would be wrong to pass by. The impression made upon us, by the sufferings of Christ, he affirms is necessary, for without it proclamation of pardon would be dangerous, and the attempt to reconcile us to God ineffectual. Seeing thus "what God will do for the practical establishment of his law," we shall never connect a feeling of license with His offer of pardon, but shall rather feel a tremulous awe in our conscience. And again, this impression "was needful to prevent a growth of license, or of indifference and insensibility to religious obligation, such as must be incurred, if the exactness and rigor of a law-system were wholly dissipated *by offers of a pardon grounded in mere leniency.*" This is almost too much for human patience. What does Dr. Bushnell mean by "offers of pardon," and "proclamations of forgiveness" in Christianity? We can understand the propriety of such language, as we have quoted, in an exposition of com-

Digitized by Google

mon Orthodoxy, where the doctrine is, that the offer to the sinner of an opportunity of salvation conflicts with the strict demands of justice, therefore that the rigors of a law-system must in some way be appeased, before they can be relaxed to man. But our author stands on opposite ground. He affirms deliberately that "Christianity, instead of pretending to be a looser, more accommodating faith, is, in fact, a law-system more exact and appalling." "I only say what is obvious to any one on simple inspection, that the law of Christianity is as much more stern in the form Christ gives it, and its distributions as much more appalling, as the precept is deeper, and the eternity of its reign more open to view." Of course, this means that men are to be judged by this law, and rewarded or punished according to their faithfulness or guilt. Where is the possibility, then, of these "lenient" offers of pardon? Where the need of such solemn fortification of the law against the imputation of laxity, and the irruption of license? Would it not seem strange to us, if we should read that a monarch, who had repealed one set of statutes, and introduced another into his kingdom more stringent and searching, more difficult to keep, and enforced by more dreadful penalties, had expressed to his subjects a fear lest his leniency might be misinterpreted, and therefore had commissioned a plenipotentiary to uphold and support the code by faithfully obeying it, in the face of hardship, for three years? Certainly, it should seem that the expressive sufferings of some Divine representative were needed under the old dispensation to show God's interest in His law, and to avert the danger of license, rather than under the new dispensation, in which the "appalling distributions" of the law appeal so clearly to human fear. Dr. Bushnell has nowhere intimated that there will be any pardon to men, under the Christian system, except on condition of penitence; and as he will not, probably, be willing to deny, after having studied the prophets and the psalms, that such offers of pardon have always characterized the Divine government, it would be pleasant to know what his forced use of terms, that are only appropriate to another style of theology, can mean.

Passing by one or two points which we had desired to touch, but which must be omitted for lack of room, let us

Digitized by Google

notice Dr. Bushnell's exposition of the objective view of Christianity. According to the subjective view, as we have seen, it is a power in the world to regenerate character, and to reconcile men to God. But the very power to regenerate and reconcile will be lost, if Christianity does not appeal to men in some other way than as pure truth to the intellect. In order to be effective, it must present itself to faith and feeling, in some forms of divine art and expression. It must be a religion *for* the soul and *before* it, so that the soul while under sin may be able to "deposite her being in an objective mercy, to let go self-amendment, to believe, and in her faith to live."

'Our mental instinct, in fact, labors intently to throw all its subjects of thought and feeling into objectivity. We call scenes *pitiful, joyful, delightful,* when it is only we that are so. We speak of *suspicious* characters, when it is we that are suspicious of them. We say *it occurs to us, it appears to us,* when we only describe what transpires within us. It is natural, also, for the mind to create objective representations which are virtual equivalents of subjective truths. The fact that memory will one day report to us all our acts and thoughts, has its objective equivalent in the idea that God keeps a judgment-book in which all our actions are recorded. The transgressor represents to himself the discomposed state of his feeling as the wrath of God. And when restored, he almost always conceives God as conciliated, not himself as reconciled. All the religions of the world have taken this objective form; they have always worked subjective effects unconsciously, through symbols, ceremonies, and pageants. Especially was this true of the Jewish religion. The Hebrew people, doubtless, held it in a manner of literality that involved real misconception. Still there was a power in their rites to produce reflex impressions, by which subjective effects were continually transpiring, so that they were made to feel repentance, and were exercised in faith to receive remission of sins. The same artistic force and immediateness of impression are needed in Christianity; its subjective doctrine must be represented in objective equivalents, and those equivalents must be drawn from the Hebrew ritual. By deliberate previous arrangement, God had prepared, through the Mosaic ceremonial, a set of terms

Digitized by Google

which should serve for the symbolic language of the facts of Christianity, a divine "altar form" as the operative vehicle of its power. So that, while Christianity dismisses the *outward* rites and objectivities of the old religion, it still keeps an element as intensely objective, only that it is internally so, and addressed to thought.

'From this point of view we discern the value of such phrases as "the *atonement* received through Christ," his "*sacrifice*" and "*offering*," his "*bearing the sins* of many," "the efficacy of his *blood*," the "*curse*" he became, the "*wrath*" he suffered, the "*righteousness*" he provided,—terms which occur in the epistles, and around which have ever hung the tenderest emotions of the Church. "As the sacred blood, yielded for sin, stood in place of a righteousness, in virtue of the impressions produced by it, so also does Christ; and as the offering was a liturgic exercise of faith and penitence, so likewise Christ is a power to regenerate character and restore us to righteousness of life. What then shall we call him, if not our righteousness; transferring again what is only subjective, in us, and beholding it in its objective source — that is, in the form of divine art and expression, by which it is wrought? This is the true attitude of faith; for if, in the utmost simplicity, we thus believe in him, if we take him, objectively, as a stock of righteousness for us, and hang ourselves upon him for supply, we can scarcely fail to have his life and character ingrafted in us. We may take his obedience as accruing to our benefit, we may see our righteousness in him, just as we see our pity in things that we say are pitiful. If we go farther, if we speak of his righteousness as imputed to us, it will not be ill, in case we hold the representation as in art, and not as dialectic or dogmatic statement." And, continuing this style of illustration, Dr. B. thinks that when we remember how Christ has come between us and our sins by his death, we may, in the same artistic manner, regard him as loading himself with our evils. If we are occupied especially with the desire of purification and cleanness of heart, we shall speak of Christ as a lustral offering, and declare that his blood cleanseth from all sin. Or, if we take the general doctrine that "God is in Christ reconciling the world unto himself," then *all* the sacrificial terms come into play, and Christ

Digitized by Google

will be called our priest, sacrifice, passover, lamb, blood of sprinkling, propitiation. In this way our subjective doctrines pass into a vicarious religion. There is a profound philosophical necessity that they should take this form, in order that the masses of mankind may have an effective gospel, and that the wisest disciples may get away from self-handling and self-cherishing cares. These terms are prepared as God's form of art, for the representation of Christ and his work; and if we refuse to let him pass into this form, interpreting the terms always in an artistic sense, we have no mould of thought that can fitly represent Christianity.'

The Scriptural authority for our author's objective view of Christ's mission is the first thing to be considered. Dr. Bushnell, of course, does not and cannot offer any direct and positive proof of his intricate theory, from the New Testament. "It is obvious," he says, "that all the most earnest Christian feelings of the apostles are collected around this objective representation — the vicarious sacrifice of Christ for the sins of the world" He should say, for he has the right only to say, it is obvious that the apostles often expressed their Christian feelings in language suggested by the Jewish ritual. The primary question, so far as Biblical authority is concerned, is this, Do the terms *sacrifice*, *blood*, *propitiation*, *bearing our sins*, &c., retain their literal, ritualistic sense when applied to Jesus, and thus endorse a vicarious theory of his mission which the intellect must hold as solid truth? The Orthodox say *yes;* Dr. Bushnell says *no*. Are they, then, figurative terms and metaphors, which were naturally suggested to the apostles by their Hebrew education, and often used, perhaps, to smooth the path for Jewish prejudices on the way to Christianity? Liberal Christians generally say *yes;* Dr. Bushnell again says *no*, and offers the objective, artistic theory. The Scriptural question between Dr. Bushnell and his Orthodox friends must be, Are the terms figurative or not? between the liberal Christians and Dr. Bushnell, What kind of figurative sense must be put upon them?

We have not room, nor do we care, to go into the question here. We object to the exegetical hypothesis of an "altar form" for the feeling of the world, because we can-

Digitized by Google

not find a tithe of the needed warrant for it in the epistles. If the sacrificial phraseology of the apostles is the basis and outline of such a structure, we think in some of their letters or addresses, especially in some communications to the Gentile believers, a sketch of it would have been given, or some hint of it been made. Hardly would the important secret have been left by providence for even Dr. Bushnell to divine. To our apprehension, it seems quite natural, according to the ordinary laws of thought, that men whose minds had from youth been saturated with influences from a system like Judaism, which they believed to have been divine, should find its symbols springing spontaneously to their lips as the signs of new emotions, and the dress of unaccustomed thoughts. The vocabulary of its rites would, of necessity, be their dictionary, and the ceremonial which their youth and manhood had revered would be the back-ground, before which their newly acquired faith would perpetually stand out to the mind's eye for comparison and contrast. We can very easily explain the letter to the Hebrews on the supposition that the poetic mind of its author either used the offices of the Mosaic religion for types, or put itself upon the search for fanciful correspondences, which pleased the imagination, as glowing statements of the Saviour's office; but if this solution be false, we see no other alternative than the belief that it must be interpreted by the common vicarious theory of the Church. Dr. Bushnell's explanation is altogether too artificial.

And even if his views were endorsed more plainly by the apostolic writings, the question, to our mind, would still remain to be discussed — whether the epistles upon all points can claim equal authority with the Saviour's teachings as expositions of Christianity. We cannot see how the miraculous commission of the apostles, which we hold to be indisputable, necessitates belief in their complete inspiration. Providence did not prevent the gospel from being mixed with human errors immediately after the apostolic age; and it may have been in harmony with perfect wisdom to suffer it, through their preaching, to take the form which their habits of thought furnished, and which would make it more effective in addressing the spiritual condition of their time. In this view it is a signifi-

Digitized by Google

cant fact that neither Dr. Bushnell's objective system, nor any other theory of Orthodoxy finds adequate support in the Gospels, nor can it be stated in any language which the Saviour used.

Dr. Bushnell's "Altar Form" of Christianity puts Christ's person, as a mystical power, too directly before the soul, and compels too large a portion of our religious emotions to end in him. We cannot ascribe too great importance to the mission of Jesus in connection with our spiritual education; but we may easily misconceive the true value of his mission. Christ did not strive to centre the religious feelings of his followers in himself, but to bring them into proper play towards the Deity. His purpose was to lift men into the same filial relations towards the Almighty which he sustained. And to do this, he revealed God to them as their Father, established his own claims as the revealer, declared the laws of inward life, in obedience to which alone they could find spiritual health and peace, and gave a clear interpretation and vivid picture of the character which God approves, in his own winning and spotless excellence. He has disclosed the way, and offered the helps to regeneration. God is the absorbing fact in religion. Christ has revealed His deepest nature to us. No man goeth to the Father but through him; but it is *to the Father* we are to go. The aim of every Christian soul must be to see, as Jesus saw, the light of God's paternity streaming from every quarter upon the world; to cherish a reliance upon providence as childlike and complete as his; to feel, in like manner, the strength and warning of the Father's omnipresence; to welcome duty with as cheerful a devotion; to manifest a self-sacrifice and charity as willing and divine. To people the earth with beings who shall stand in the same moral relation to the Deity which the natural side of Christ's experience reveals, is the hope of the gospel; and although, by many this may be thought, as it is often called, too cold a theory, we are convinced that more warm and poetic ones are in themselves unhealthy, and, in some way, breed spiritual disease.

Dr. Bushnell's exposition of the "Altar Form" in religion makes what is false in fact powerful as an illusion. It is shocking to believe that Christ actually died for us in

Digitized by Google

the sacrificial sense, that his sufferings ransomed us from the toils of law, that his blood in any way conciliated God, and opened a possibility of pardon; and yet, practically, we must feel all this, must train our hearts to recognize Christ as our righteousness, our hope, our vicarious redemption, before inward health and freedom in goodness can be acquired! If a doctrine or a set of symbols be so powerful for human regeneration when empty of all subjective meaning, one can hardly conceive the greater influence they would exert if they could appear to the mind to be something more than husks and shells alone; and since it is by delusion only, or at least in spite of abstract truth, that we are to be saved, surely the theologian can hardly expect forgiveness, who deliberately perils the power of a ritual by unveiling the mockery of the show.

Nor can the plea be allowed that the "altar form" must be judged as an artistic matter, and is not amenable to logical laws. Truth and art can never be divorced. There is not one kind of truth to the imagination, and another to the mind. It is not the province of art to take liberties with truth, but to suggest it to us through peculiar media, to throw it back upon us from the mirrors of beauty, to make the whole nature glow with a recognition of it under an æsthetic veil. Art never has claimed a *carte blanche* for the choice of truth or falsehood, but merely for the selection of her own method of expression, with which logic has no right to interfere, and before which it is her highest wisdom willingly to bow. And the forms of expression in true art, however varied they may be, are never hostile to the fact or law to be revealed. Macbeth must be interpreted by other measures of sense and power than can be brought to an essay on ambition and conscience; but the terrific power of the piece springs from the splendid harmony of its æsthetic drapery with its subjective law. The Laocoon and the Madonna produce impressions which abstract descriptions cannot excite; but the artist in each case achieved his triumphs, not by calculating how to produce so much impression, but by working in accordance with the truth before his mind. The blended sorrow, modesty, scorn and resignation in the face of the Greek slave, may purify our ideal of excellence better than words can do; but, in order to be moved by it, we are not to study that

Digitized by Google

face as though it expressed something else than those simple qualities, something more mysterious and indefinable. The greatness of art does not lie in its indifference to truth, but in its power of suggestion and expression. We do not complain that Dr. Bushnell would have an artistic element in Christianity. We complain that the symbols which he has described, spurn the bonds of subjective truth, have no formal relation to the facts they should enclose, and are created, not to give illuminated statements of some hidden principle, but, contrary to the proprieties of art, to arouse and cherish impressions which, however useful, are hostile to reality. The life of Christ is the artistic power of the gospel, for it is the divinely arranged transparency through which the ideal light falls upon the world, dispelling our darkness, and disclosing, at the same time, a figure in which we recognise at once suggested features of the Almighty's character, and the full glory of a perfect soul.

We may say, also, that Dr. Bushnell's objective view of the gospel is of little value, from the fact that a created mental symbol, or one which we completely see through, cannot have such power as he attributes to the "Altar Form." A ritual pageant, worked before the *senses* under appropriate circumstances, will stir the feelings and exalt the imagination of one who has little respect, perhaps, for the truth it veils. But a set of *mental* symbols which are proved to be empty of the sense which their form suggests, and to which a man must fit his mind in the coolest moods of retirement, is truly a wonderful triumph of art. A conference meeting of theologians like Dr. B., all fresh from the anatomical labors of their studies, where the vicarious scheme had been dissected as a curiosity, yet each in turn exhorting the rest in the language of its doctrines, would be a desirable spectacle. Dr. Bushnell describes the attempt of a soul to reach healthy goodness, on the Unitarian scheme, by the figure of a man trying to lift himself by the shoulders. Really we do not think the dilemma is relieved by putting the man in a basket, and bidding him strain at the handles.

It is difficult to determine, from the language which Dr. B. has used, what state of feeling it is which this ideal liturgy will induce, and how it is to be awakened. Self-culture, he tells us, has nothing to do with religion, however

Digitized by Google

sacred the causes we apply to ourselves, until we deposit our soul in God, and in the forms of exercise and feeling which are offered us by Him. If Christ has brought us a spiritual remedy for our sin, it will be insufficient if we are to apply it to our particular wants and diseases. When a man is addressing his own nature with means, motives, and remedies, he is held to that which he needs most of all to escape, viz.: the hinging of his life on himself and the interests of his own person. And therefore he needs a religion objectively made out for him; "so that, when he is ready to faint, he may drop himself, by an act of faith, and total self-renunciation, into the objective grace provided, there to deposit himself and cease even to be, save in his Saviour." This is too shadowy to criticise, for it is too vague to be understood. It may be very true that constant and microscopic self-inspection is not the method of spiritual health; but the necessity of an "altar form" of religion is not the corollary of that truth. If it be a fact that men cannot please God at all by their works, and are only admitted to divine favor through the condescension and expressional sufferings of Jesus, then the emotions of the soul must be absorbed with the provisions for its escape from perdition; and we can well see how the true religious state would be "to hang ourselves upon the altar of sacrifice sprinkled by the blood of Jesus, to quiet our soul in his peace, clothe it in his righteousness, and trust him as the Lamb of God that taketh away our sin." But if Christianity be the trumpet-call to a new and nobler life, if it bring the means of regeneration only to set up a higher law of righteousness, enforced by "appalling" sanctions, which law of course we are required to obey, we need to be informed more clearly why a ritual that is subjectively untrue is necessary to help us to keep the law, and how its effects are realized by the mind. Besides, it seems evident to us that this "altar form" must legitimate itself to every man according to his private sense of need. Dr. Bushnell admits that it is possible to have a Christian experience without it. It is dangerous, he says, to let it go; but perhaps no one man can judge of the religious necessities of a different class of minds. And if a man says deliberately, I do'nt need it, it is a hindrance or a sham to me — we do not see how Dr. Bushnell would reply.

Digitized by Google

Or, if we must believe that some artistic presentation of religion is necessary to produce a true subjective state, then any is good, to a particular man, which will produce that state, and so every body may be left to frame an "altar form" that will best meet his want.

And, in our view, the objective system we are considering is vitiated by the mystical estimate of life which it implies. We are told that "to be ever lifting ourselves by our will, to be hanging round our works, canvassing our defects, and studying the pathology of our evils, were enough, of itself, to drive one mad." We assent to this most cordially; but when we are told, as a remedy for such an evil, that in the "simple, unselfish, unreflective exercises" of a mental liturgy we "make our closest approach to God," we insist that the Christian law of culture is lost sight of, and a false law intruded in its place. Dr. Bushnell nowhere recognises the value of cheerful devotion to Christian duties as the true sanative of the soul, and the condition of the truest peace. The condition of firm, lasting spiritual health is steady work, as the expression of stable faith. Christianity has a simple objective scheme of training, which Dr. Bushnell is not alone in having missed. "If ye do his will, ye shall know of the doctrine." "Whoso looketh into the perfect law of liberty, and continueth therein, he being not a forgetful hearer, but a doer of the work, this man *shall be blessed in his deed.*" If a man is always inquiring into the grounds of his faith, and trying to shear all mystery from the propositions of religion, his anxieties, and perplexities, and oscillations of mood, will at last be generalized in the constant prayer — "Lord, I believe; help thou my unbelief." The true regimen, however unpoetic it may seem, is to settle, on general grounds, the broad principles of religion; and then, letting logic go, to enthrone them over the will, live them out, and let faith tighten its own roots in a deep practical soil. When a man's frame is wasted and dyspeptic, it is not true wisdom in him to spend the time in looking mournfully at his shrunken muscles, and sighing for health while the stomach gives its warning twinge of pain. A cure will not be effected till the fibres have a chance to brace themselves by exercise, till the activity of the mind is directed to other subjects, so that a healthy tone may be re-

Digitized by Google

stored by the play of laws that work in secret, and are only arrested by being anxiously observed. And so we must not try to find religious peace in the mystical way, by striving, directly, and with malice prepense, to lose ourselves in God. There is a wholesome distance for the soul to keep. In the orbit of duty we find the only healthy nearness to the central spiritual light. And if there is danger that the soul may be enslaved by a legal virtue, and tormented with introspective methods of relief, a wise physician will not prescribe seclusion in an oratory where mystic symbols, that violate the stubborn truth of nature, may refresh for a moment the wilted mind; nor will he order it to be swung, like a rheumatic sufferer, in some soft hammock of liturgy, where it may be lulled into dreamy unconsciousness of its disease; he will know that the proper remedy is to cast it upon some unselfish labor, to bid it forget itself in generous toil, assured that the peace it seeks, and the strength it needs, must be the incidental return of faithfulness, the pleasurable glow of spiritual health. The valves which allow the influx of the Divine spirit into the soul, are opened from within; and they only yield to the unclosing pressure of a faithful will. Mysticism and quietism represent the futile ambition of the heart to find a more direct path towards communion with the Deity, and a more attractive escape from "self-handling cares," than systematic dedication of the active powers to the practical demands of the Christian law. Meditation is one of our spiritual wings; but faithfulness must be added, before the soul is furnished with a pair. He that loseth his life, in duty, for the sake of Christ, shall find it. The peace-giving ritual of the gospel is disinterested work.

Here we must take leave of Dr. Bushnell's book. Our readers have reason, on many accounts, to regret that we have looked exclusively at the consistency of his theology. And certainly the tone of our criticism, upon many of his speculative positions, neither represents the deepest interest which his volume has awakened in us, nor our feeling towards the man. Had we chosen to bring together the choice passages from these Discourses, we might have filled the pages we have occupied, with a literary repast which

Digitized by Google

could hardly be excelled. Or, had we attempted to calculate the influence it will exert upon Orthodox theology, and the developement of higher views of Christianity, expressions of gratitude would have been substituted for the language of dissent. We see another proof that nature loves the oscillating, vibratory, method of progress, in the fact that Connecticut has nurtured and sheltered Dr. Taylor and Dr. Bushnell. The grim, granite visage of our New England Orthodoxy, of late years, has begun mysteriously to warm with life, and occasionally has relaxed into something like a smile. But now its stony lips, as if melted miraculously by the dawning sunlight, have burst into a rich, musical, and captivating chant. What is to be the immediate fate of this volume in the councils that must decide its fate, it would be desirable to know. It is a fine contribution to spiritual literature; it is a mortal blow at the system which, after abandoning to the reason, it strives to reconcile with the heart, of the world. The inconsistencies in it will soon fall away and leave its principles to their natural effect upon the community. If the author's associates attempt to crush the elastic energies which it contains, it will surely explode, and make, at least, some noise. If they let it alone, it will do its work by gradually warming and vivifying their system, so that it will be changed in every thing but the name. T. S. K.

Digitized by Google

Article XXIV.

The Biblical Argument for Capital Punishment as a Divine Ordinance.

An Essay on the Ground and Reason of Punishment, with special reference to the Penalty of Death; by Tayler Lewis, Esq. And a Defence of Capital Punishment, by Rev. George Cheever, D. D. With an Appendix, containing a Review of Burleigh on the Death Penalty. New York: Wiley and Putnam, 161 Broadway. 1846. 12mo. pp. 365.

When we looked into this work, on its first appearance, we thought there were several things worthy of serious consideration in Prof. Lewis's Essay, and a good deal of ability, of the forensic kind, in Dr. Cheever's Defence. Yet it did not strike us, at the time, that the main argument was such as to need a reply. Doubtless, the writers exposed some cavils and captious criticisms, and overturned some extreme grounds, that had been resorted to by some of the various parties on the opposite side. This it was easy to do. But when they came to argue their own fundamental position, namely, that Capital Punishment is a positive ordinance of God, universally and perpetually binding like his moral laws, we thought they made out their plea by means only of assumptions that were too gross to escape the notice of careful thinkers, whether advocates or opponents.

Such was our impression, at the time. Our attention, however, has been recalled to the work, by a very different judgement, lately pronounced upon it, in a leading Periodical of our most influential religious denominations; and we have taken pains to go over the argument again. "It is," says the Biblical Repository for last April, "a "masterly argument, based on the Divine authority, and on "the experience of the world, in favor of Capital Punish-"ment; and all attempts to set it aside, or evade its con-"clusions, are vain. It has already done a great work. "It has made a deep and salutary impression on the "public mind; restrained, as by a mountain-barrier, that

Digitized by Google

"tide of licentiousness, irreligion, and mock-sensibility," &c. "Nothing so convincing, so logically irresistible, has been "written, as this argument of Dr. Cheever. It ought to be "read and pondered by every legislator, judge, juryman, "minister, layman, and citizen, that its principles and con-"clusions may be embodied in public sentiment, and made "to control the legislation and jurisprudence of this great "country."

This commendation, from so respectable a quarter, has led us to suppose that the argument may be at least as strong as any which is known on that side of the question; that it is, in fact, the argument on which the advocates of Capital Punishment as a Divine ordinance, rest the cause. To say nothing of their making it the basis of an attempt "to control the legislation and jurisprudence of this great country," it is probably the ground of personal conviction with a numerous class. If so, by meeting it, we shall meet the great difficulty which they feel to be in the way of abolishing, or commuting, that penalty. Let us, then, look into this "logically irresistible" plea; we mean, into that part of it which claims the sanction of the Scriptures and the Divine authority.

The reason why we confine the examination to this, is, that the Biblical argument, as it is called, or the argument for a divine command, is what gives life and character to the whole. Take this away, and all that remains is, simply, a question of civil legislation, to be disposed of on the same general principles with other questions of the kind. The plea that God has fixed the matter, unalterably, by an express injunction, is the vital part of the whole cause, as Messrs. Lewis and Cheever have argued it, and, we suppose, as it is popularly held.

It is well, in the outset, to mark distinctly what the plea itself is—what its hypothesis is,—that we may not go stumbling about in a mist. Let us, first, see clearly the position that is contended for. It is not merely that God did, in ancient times, institute or authorize Capital Punishment for a particular state of society then existing; nor is it merely that he has never since expressly forbidden it, but allowed it to stand on the same ground with every thing else that belongs to civil legislation. It is not even

Digitized by Google

that he gives human governments the right to inflict that penalty, when they find it to be necessary; leaving them, however, to judge of the necessity, or exigency, as he leaves them to do with respect to all other civil penalties. We should be careful to observe, that nothing of this kind is what is pleaded for, but something fundamentally different, and indeed wholly anomalous. The ground taken, though seldom stated in its most extraordinary aspects, is, that God, by a positive statute of universal and perpetual obligation, commands us, directly commands us, to put the murderer to death; so that, of course, it is rebellion against him to set that particular form of punishment aside, or to attempt to set it aside, and to substitute any other which may seem to us more salutary. Neither governments nor individuals have any right to move in the case, except to receive, and carry into execution, a statute already established by the word of God. It is a solitary exception from the otherwise universal province of human legislation over crime. In all other cases, God only enjoins, on "the powers that *now* be," the eternal principles of justice and mercy, and leaves them to work out these principles into such statutes as the circumstances may appear to demand; but, in this one case, he supersedes that rule, and comes forth directly as our civil Legislator, enacting the civil penalty for all times and places, as he has done with respect to no other crime in the whole penal code. In this particular, all governments and all persons are under a civil Theocracy, as much as the ancient Jews were.

This is the ground covered by the plea. It seems, on the face of it, to belong with other Theocratical hypotheses that have had their day; such as the divine right of kings, and of the kingly form of government to the exclusion of every other, the divine obligation of God's people, in all times, to exterminate obstinate heathens, the universal obligation to put witches to death, &c. All these have been proved, or have been thought to be proved, by arguments as "logically irresistible," and as far-fetched also, as the one in question. We would ask its advocates whether they have ever looked its Theocratical aspects full in the face, so as to be completely aware what it is they propose to maintain. No doubt, many ingeniously linked

Digitized by Google

chains of reasoning, many verbal criticisms of the high-pressure kind, many dove-tailings of texts with assumptions and inferences, can be framed in its favor, if we will but take time enough,—as there have likewise been framed for the other Theocratical hypotheses that we have classed with it. But, after all, do its advocates themselves feel quite prepared, as yet, to take their stand boldly on so desperate a position, when they see what it is? It would be well to settle, in their own minds, definitely, what it is they are pleading for; for no right, that may be used when needed, but for an absolute injunction that takes all such right away. All the best and wisest statesmen may become convinced, like Sir James Mackintosh and others, that Capital Punishment does not work favorably in our present state of society, and that a different penalty would better secure the public good; but, even then, they must not try the experiment of a change, or if it has been tried and found beneficial they must not continue it, because here is God's unevadable command for bloodshed. The whole community of freemen and lawmakers may become satisfied that, under existing circumstances, it brutalizes and vitiates more than it deters, as they in general are already satisfied is the case with public executions; but still they must not vote, nor move, for a remedy, because it would be impiety in them to assume any such jurisdiction, in the premises, as they possess with respect to every other overt offence. In this one point, we are shut out from all free legislation, and from all discretionary power, being under an absolute Theocracy.

We think its advocates will feel that nothing short of tolerably plain proof can justify so strange a position. And now, what is the proof that is relied upon for the purpose? any statute directly in point, imposed on society everywhere and in all ages? or, has it to be made out by assumptions, by supposing a form of command, and then a universality of its application, that are not given in the text itself? If we understand the plea, the only proof, which it claims as positive, is the noted sentence found among the declarations that God addressed to Noah and his sons after the flood: "Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed; for in the image of God

Digitized by Google

made he man," (Gen. ix. 6.) This is all that is alleged as direct support; not a word, not a hint, of an ordinance imperative on mankind through all after times and dispensations; nor, indeed, on civil governments at any time, since no such organizations are recognized, either in the passage or in its context, neither did they then exist; nor can we say with certainty that it was intended as an absolute command even to the people of that age to which it was addressed, since it may have been declaratory, rather than imperative, in its meaning, as it actually is in its form. And this is to be taken as direct and sufficient proof of an hypothesis so vastly wider! an hypothesis in itself so unlikely, and so contradictory to the general provision for human government! There are some other texts and Scripture-facts, that are pleaded as incidentally corroborative, of which we may take notice in the sequel; but, if deprived of this one passage, it is virtually conceded that the whole falls to the ground.

Now, plain common-sense, unschooled in the arts of glossing language with foreign meanings, would see nothing in this passage that answers to the exorbitant demands of the proposition. It would just as soon find a Theocratical ordinance, of universal obligation, to slay all who bear arms, in those words of our Saviour: "Put up again thy sword into his place; for all they that take the sword, shall perish with the sword." Does any body think it would be difficult for an expert hypothesis-framer to make out, after the fashion of Dr. Cheever, a case from these words, with the help of verbal analogies, possible allusions, and gratuitous premises? and especially with the advantage of the precept being a part of the Christian dispensation? In justice we might here dismiss his argument, as manifestly a failure at the outset. The proof, adduced as positive, is not positive, nor in any respect such as the natural improbability and singularly anomalous character of the hypothesis require. We cannot reasonably be held to listen, in a question of practical moment, to a series of ingenious and far-fetched subtilities, as proof of a notion so apparently extravagant in itself,—we mean, when we find that the principal evidence brought forward does not fairly meet the case. We may then rule the matter out of hearing, at once. Unless we

Digitized by Google

adopt for general use, some such rule, of exclusion by *default*, the promise, that the flood shall not again cover the earth, would be of little worth to us, for we should be drowned with a more noisome deluge of extravagances, wild schemes, and desperate partisan theories, rushing in upon us from above and beneath, from the broken up fountains of Symmes's great Deep, and from the opened windows of Davis's Univercœlum.

Lest it be suspected, however, that there must of course be strong points, somewhere, in an argument which is held up with such confident defiance, let us follow it through, notwithstanding all its subtilities, and in spite of the distance to which it forages abroad for supplies. As we go along, we shall endeavor, also, to pass in review the sources that are popularly supposed to afford some evidence for the proposition.

Perhaps it may be thought that the Mosaic code would furnish more direct support for the hypothesis than is to be found in the declarations to Noah; since it is unquestionable that God did, therein, expressly command the Jews to inflict Capital Punishment for a great number of offences. But then we must observe, that its advocates do not venture to seek direct support in that quarter; because, were they to adduce the Mosaic code as binding on us at this day, certain unwelcome consequences would come in with it. 1. It would extend the penalty much farther than is desired: to all idolaters as well as to murderers, to witches and wizzards and those who consult them, to adulterers, man-stealers, false prophets, unchaste females who marry without first declaring their frailty, Sabbath-breakers, or those who even kindle a fire in their dwellings on the Sabbath, contumelious children, to those who eat flesh with the blood in it, and to several other descriptions of persons. It is therefore felt that it will not do to plead, in a direct way, the Capital Punishments that were enacted in the Mosaic law, as it would be like bringing in an ally whose exterminating sword could not be stayed short of too frightful a havoc. More than twenty different offences, some of which are now practised by every body, become Capital, when once the Jewish code is called to our aid. And 2, besides all this, every body sees that to

Digitized by Google

admit the outward statutes of that law as obligatory at present, would oblige us to be circumcised,—in short, to become Jews and give up "the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free," to abolish even our existing forms of civil government, and take the whole system of the Jewish Theocracy entire. These consequences would plainly be inevitable, and they are too formidable to be incurred. Even Prof. Lewis and Dr. Cheever are careful, at least are anxious, to shun this rock. The former says, (p. 88,) "We should hesitate to rest the cause alone on these grounds, [the Mosaic statutes,] if the Bible furnished us with no other." The latter says, (p. 142,) "To that code, [the Jewish,] we do not resort for argument; it is unnecessary; we do not rest the right or duty of Capital Punishment on any part of it."

And yet, if our readers will believe us, to that very code both of these writers do "resort for argument." It is one of the most curious examples, that we have seen, of men struggling between conscious danger of absurdity, on the one hand, and an overcoming sense of need that impels them to it, on the other. Dr. Cheever finishes the sentence, last quoted, by adding, "nevertheless, it [the Mosaic code,] forms a luminous commentary on the ordinance revealed to Noah." And he then proceeds, through several pages, to insist on the positiveness with which Capital Punishment was exacted by the Jewish law, just as if this "luminous commentary," as he calls it, defined the ordinance for us, as well as for the ancient Jews, and as if the positiveness related to us as well as to them! in which case, one would suppose, we must inflict the penalty to the full extent prescribed by those explanatory statutes. And Prof. Lewis says expressly, that, of the two arguments from the Old Testament, "the one is derived from the clear and undisputed provisions of the Jewish law, requiring, in all cases, the death of the wilful murderer, without any compensation or equivalent. *Thou shalt take him even from my altar, saith the Lord.* It was no mere *permission*, to make it a part of their criminal code, with an alternative, if they chose to venture upon a hazardous experiment; but a positive command, acompanied with a threat of vengeance against the land, if the law was not carried into the most strict and rigorous execution." (p. 87.)

Digitized by Google

This is the consideration that he urges. But, does Prof. Lewis hold that the Jewish law is binding on us? Of course, we suppose Not. How, then, does he derive from it an argument to bind us fast by its provisions? We confess, we cannot tell. The following is his own exposition of the matter; if our readers can see, in it, any relevancy to his object, they must analyze it for themselves, for here our skill fails us. "Whilst admitting that, as matter of detail, the particular Jewish legislation may not, *per se*, be obligatory on us, yet as honestly holding to the inspiration and Divine authority of the Old Testament, and firmly believing that all 'the words of the book of this law' were actually spoken by Almighty God, we must contend that, however liable to modification in their particular application to times and circumstances, they do contain, in their principles and in their essence, the elements of eternal truth. The specific statute was made, it is true, for the Jewish people; but the reasons and sanctions assigned are for all nations, and for all times. The principles on which the law is grounded, are as immutable as the Lawgiver himself." (p. 88.) Now, we may admit all this, in every sense that the writer can be supposed to have intended; we do indeed hold to the inspiration and Divine authority of the Old Testament, and believe that the *ultimate* principles, on which the Mosaic law was grounded, are immutable. But we have no conception of any force or bearing, in all this, on the point now in hand. With much respect for him, we put the question to the Professor, Do you mean that, since the Mosaic law was given by God, it is imperative on us, in any such way as that we must adopt its outward provisions, even those of a general kind,—to say nothing of its particular statutes in detail? Of these latter you seem to make an exception; are we, however, bound by its general form of civil government, by its general code of penalties, by its general ritual of religious observances? We have always thought that the outward law was originally instituted, not for Gentiles, but for the Jews alone; and for them only "till the time of reformation." But do you mean that it had no such limitation, and that we must now go back to its civil Theocracy, its national Church and Priesthood, its ground-rite of circumcision, its fleshly sacrifices,

Digitized by Google

its multifold penalty of death, &c., because all these are leading or general features of that law? If you say Yes, we can understand you, and admire your consistency; if you say No, pray tell us (for we do not understand) how you get your argument, from it, for the perpetual obligation of that one item, Capital Punishment? And when you shall have explained this, it will be necessary to show us, (for we are wholly in the dark,) how you make that penalty obligatory on one or two crimes, but not on the rest which it equally covers. We hold the Mosaic law sacred for the purposes for which it was given; but we avow to the world that no argument is "logically irresistible" with us, that admits the revocation of a temporary law, and still appeals to it as proof of the perpetual force of some one of its provisions.

Dr. Cheever is more wary, repeatedly advertizing us that he does not appeal to the Mosaic institutions as a sanction now valid. He has a method, that we can understand, by which he hopes to obtain some help from them, and yet to avoid the absurdity of bringing the whole code into force. Let us mark the distinction: He adduces the injunctions of Capital Punishment in the Mosaic statutes, not because they are Mosaic statutes, but because they are, he says, a "commentary on the ordinance revealed to Noah;" or because, by referring back to that original command, they re-promulgate it. (pp. 142, 145, 161, 245, &c.) But, re-promulgate it for whom? we would ask. Certainly not for us, but for the Jews, for whom the ordinance was thus reiterated, and for whom it needed to be reiterated in order to make it binding in their case. And since we have no similar reiteration, nor explicit recognition, of it, in the Christian dispensation, it is not of course brought to bear on us, as it was on the ancient Jews. Does not Dr. Cheever see that, in his eagerness to collect arguments, he has laid his hand on one that points the other way?

Let him not be alarmed, however; we can assure him that the argument is good for nothing, either way; for it is based on a pure fiction. All this alleged recognizance, in the Jewish law, of the declaration to Noah, is an invention of his own. His management, in this case, deserves notice. He quotes a number of statutes from the Mosaic

Digitized by Google

law, in which Capital Punishment was enjoined with reference, he asserts, to the old Noachic ordinance. For instance: "In the 35th chapter of Numbers," says he, "in the last five verses, there is a manifest reference to this ordinance." Again: of Exod. xxi. 14, and Deut. xix. 13, he says, "the tenor of these declarations, their point, explicitness, urgency, and severity, would incline us to think that God had observed, at that period, the same unwillingness to execute the penalty of the Noachic ordinance, the same false sensibility, and the same tendency to infidelity, which at intervals prevails in society at the present day;" and that God, therefore, re-enforced the original penalty with the more emphasis. He speaks, off-hand, of the "reassertion," and "reiteration," of that ordinance, by the Mosaic law; he informs us that the statutes of Capital Punishment, in the latter, were framed under the authority of the former universal statute, and looked back to it; he insists that this remarkable reference serves to confirm the universality and perpetuity of the declaration to Noah, since it shows that God himself recognized its authority in his long subsequent legislation for the Jews. This is a favorite argument with him: it fills a large space in his book; he returns to it again and again. We have already seen what bearing it would have, were the alleged fact only true; but we need not inform those who are familiar with the laws of Moses, that there is no such reference to Noah, nor hint of such reference, in all their enactments, and injunctions, of Capital Punishment. The whole of this allegation, which plays so prominent a part, is but one of our author's assumptions. If the memory of our readers does not serve them, they can easily turn to the texts, noted above, which he selected as special examples; and they will see how much we are indebted to his inventive imagination. What we have pointed out, in this one case, is everywhere characteristic of his work. In nearly all of its chapters, some interpolating or perverting glosses, some fictitious premises, or gratuitous postulates, glide smoothly into the current of its rhetoric, and help to make out the desired conclusion. We seldom meet with a writer who equals him in this respect. As an amusing example of the gravity with which he uses the first of these methods, see the turn he gives to the text describing

Digitized by Google

a religious man who shall dwell on high: "he that despiseth the gain of oppressions, that shaketh his hands from holding of bribes, that stoppeth his ears from hearing of blood,"—that is, says Dr. Cheever, "will not, for one moment, listen to any thing, but the execution of the Divine law upon the murderer. All this is remarkable." (p. 253.) We scarcely ever saw any thing more so.

To the hypothesis, then, of a Theocratical injunction in our day, no aid is furnished by the Mosaic code, either directly, or as a "commentary" on the declaration to Noah. The simple fact is, that God commanded the Jews to inflict the punishment of death, not for murder only, but also for some twenty or thirty other offences; and that this command, belonging as it did to the general system of their Theocracy, cannot be separated from it, and has no more obligation on us than has the rest of the system. We know it is easy, if these considerations be kept out of sight, to declaim on the sacredness of those laws, so as to produce popular effect. Enthusiastic, or designing, partisans may say, with such a view, "The laws were not those of Moses, but of God. The whole code, from beginning to end, was framed by Divine inspiration, and possessed the authority of the Divine sanction." And to all this we answer, Very true. But when they proceed to infer, in substance, 'What impiety then, what infidelity, what enmity against religion, to set those laws aside! and to get the community to set them aside! What presumption to substitute our own statutes for those of God! Mark, how solemnly, how stringently, he enjoins the infliction of death for murder [alone!], how he expressly forbids, in the most pointed manner, any sparing, or commutation, and threatens vengeance on the whole land, in case of neglect,' &c.—when they fall into such a strain, we are tempted to make one request of them, namely, that they be consistent; that they keep straight on, in the same lofty tone, through all the statutes and provisions of that law which are enjoined with equal solemnity; expostulating with those who will not be circumcised, who will not put all idolaters and witches and diviners and certain unchaste females to death, nor execute this penalty on such as kindle fires, or gather sticks, on the Sabbath, who will not help to extirpate the heathen

Digitized by Google

tribes, root and branch, in the manner prescribed, &c. They have the same grounds for rebuke, in these cases, as in the other. But we show them a better way: "Now the end of the commandment is charity out of a pure heart, and of a good conscience, and of faith unfeigned; from which some having swerved have turned aside unto vain jangling, desiring to be teachers of the law, understanding neither what they say, nor whereof they affirm."

We have now mentioned all the proofs that our authors find in the Old Testament. In the New, Dr. Cheever discovers four passages, which he thinks either recognize the declaration to Noah as still binding, or else directly imply the Divine authority of Capital Punishment. They are the following. 1. The rebuke of Christ to Peter, when the latter smote off the ear of the high-priest's servant: "Put up again thy sword into his place; for all they that take the sword, shall perish with the sword."[1] 2. St. Paul's answer to Festus, when arraigned under a charge, not of murder, but of sedition and of profaning the temple, to which his language refers: "I stand at Cæsar's judgement-seat, where I ought to be judged; to the Jews have I done no wrong, as thou very well knowest. For if I be an offender, or have committed any thing *worthy of death, I refuse not to die;* but if there be none of these things whereof they accuse me, no man may deliver me unto them. I appeal unto Cæsar."[2] 3. St. Paul's injunction to "be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God; the powers that be, are ordained of God. . . . . If thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for *he beareth not the sword in vain;* for he is a minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil."[3] 4. The remark of St. John in the Revelation, with reference to the war which the beast waged with the saints, and in which he overcame them for a while: "He that leadeth into captivity, shall go into captivity; he that killeth with the sword, must be killed with the sword."[4] (pp. 149, 150, 151, 247, 248, 259.) We mean no disrespect to Dr. Cheever, for we are far from feeling any; but, we must not affront the common-sense of our readers, by supposing comments to be necessary towards showing that these passages have no reference to his subject. We

[1] Matt. xxvi. 52. [2] Acts, xxv. 10, 11. [3] Rom. xiii. 1–7. [4] Rev. xiii. 10.

Digitized by Google

repeat: this is said without involving disrespect to him; for we readily conceive how an earnest pleader, of brilliant imagination and even powerful mind, but wholly intent on strengthening his cause, may resort to desperate means, which a spectator, of tamer spirit, sees in all their extravagance. Still, that intemperate partisanship ought unquestionably to be rebuked, which treats the Scriptures with such violence in order to strain them to its ends. It seems often to be forgotten, that the Bible may be more irreparably desecrated, in the public mind, by this rash abuse from its friends, than by the assaults of infidelity.

And now, after following our authors through the Mosaic law, and through the gospel, in their search for some additional support, some relative confirmation, of their hypothesis; after seeing the utmost that Dr. Cheever can do, even with his "logically irresistible" plea, in drawing passages forth from these sources, we find that we must fall back wholly on that one solitary sentence, taken from the declarations to Noah and his sons: "Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed: for in the image of God made he man." Here we must settle down, at last. Not only is this the sole positive proof, it is the sole proof of any kind, which can be adduced from the Scriptures, that God has superseded the general freedom of human legislation, in the case of murder, and established a universal and perpetual Theocracy over that crime.

We trust our readers will keep in mind that the question is not, whether he allows to civil governments a right to inflict the penalty of death, on the same ground with other penalties, when honestly deemed necessary; much less, whether he authorized it in a particular state of society that once existed, as he authorized the utter massacre of heathen tribes. The only point we are concerned with, in this controversy, is, Did he, in his declaration to Noah, impose a direct statute of this purport, on all mankind, through every coming age and dispensation? The matter of fact is, that he did not; there is no such statute expressed, none that is evidently implied. It has to be made out, if made out at all, by inference after inference; all, of too uncertain a tenure for so extreme a conclusion to be

Digitized by Google

hazarded upon them. We must first infer, or properly speaking assume, that the declarative, the indicative, form of the sentence is to be taken imperatively: as it may, or may not be, according to grammatical construction. But we must make no allowance for the uncertainty; we must assume that it positively commands Noah and his sons to slay the murderer as a religious duty, instead of announcing a general fact which God had, for the time being, secured in his providence by means of human agency. Having done this, we must then assume, outright, that all which was addressed to Noah and his sons, was addressed to the whole human race in all after times; of which we know there is no intimation, either here or elsewhere. It is said to be one of the Rabbinic traditions, which are not of good repute in the gospel. And lastly, we must assume that the supposed command was given to all mankind, not in their individual capacity, as all other universal and perpetual commands are given, but merely to legislators in civil governments, such as did not then exist. It must be a political command, not a personal one; so Dr. Cheever himself admits. (pp. 159, 161.) These are the steps which we must ourselves construct, out of nothing, in order to climb from the passage up to the proposed conclusion. It is a question of serious moment, notwithstanding its ludicrous aspect, Are our law-makers and citizens quite ready to mount on this airy ladder, as a basis sufficiently broad and firm for the attempt, which seems to be recommended, "to control the legislation and jurisprudence of this great country"?

Let us see what the whole passage is, from which this fragment is taken; for the whole ought to be read together, and understood according to some uniform rule that will serve for every part. "And God blessed Noah and his sons and said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth. And the fear of you, and the dread of you, shall be upon every beast of the earth, and upon every fowl of the air, upon all that moveth upon the earth, and upon all the fishes of the sea; into your hand are they delivered. Every moving thing that liveth shall be meat for you; even as the green herb have I given you all things. But flesh, with the life thereof, which is the blood thereof, shall ye not eat. And surely your blood of

Digitized by Google

your lives will I require; at the hand of every beast will I require it, and at the hand of man; at the hand of every man's brother will I require the life of man. Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed; for in the image of God made he man. And you, be ye fruitful, and multiply; bring forth abundantly in the earth, and multiply therein."[5] Passing over the repeated encouragement to replenish the then desolate earth, and the promise that their dread should be on all the lower creatures, here are five things to be observed. 1. The special reference of the whole to Noah and his sons: "And God blessed Noah and his sons, and said unto them," &c. Some of the particulars that follow are, of course, equally applicable to others; as is the case with most addresses to men of any given period. 2. The sanction to eat animal food, to the fullest extent: "Every moving thing that liveth shall be meat for you; even as the green herb have I given you all things." 3. The prohibition to eat flesh with the blood in it: "But flesh with the life thereof, which is the blood thereof, shall ye not eat." 4. The declaration that God would exact their life of every beast that should kill them: "Your blood of your lives will I require; at the hand of every beast will I require it." And 5. A similar declaration with respect to every man who should kill: "At the hand of man, at the hand of every man's brother, will I require the life of man. Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed: for in the image of God made he man." Here, in this last clause, is given the reason for the peculiar sacredness of human life, over that of brutes.

Now, we ask, Does all this appear, on the face of it, as if designed to be a code, in the strict sense of the term? especially, to be a body of positive regulations for all men and governments, in all ages? We do not inquire, whether it is announced as such, nor whether it is denoted as such by any obvious implication, or hint; we know that it is not. But, even, is it apparently adapted to such a purpose? The easy and unconstrained interpretation of the whole,—the idea which we should naturally gather up from the language and circumstances, without applying the wrench of hypercriticism to them, is, that here is briefly

[5] Gen. ix. 1–7.

Digitized by Google

sketched out the general order which God, in the progressive course of his providence, established for those primitive ages: that men were called to replenish the waste earth; that they were in general terms constituted lords over the lower creatures; that they were allowed the whole range of brutes, as well as of vegetables, for food, without the restrictions afterwards imposed on the Jews; that nevertheless, to cherish in them a reverence for the mysterious principle of life, they were prohibited from eating flesh with its blood in it; that to impress them with the paramount sacredness of human life, it was provided that they should slay every beast which had killed a person; and that the same provision was made with respect to every man who took the life of his fellow-creature. There was something more than crime, there was sacrilege, in this last offence, howsoever it occurred; for man was made in the image of God. No distinction is drawn between what is now called manslaughter and what is called murder; nor is it probable that such a distinction was very carefully recognized in practice. Even at a much later period, the unintentional manslayer was exposed to the fate of the wilful murderer, till he reached a city of refuge. No hint is given of a judicial investigation of the case; in the simplicity of Noah's age, the human culprit was probably pursued with nearly as little form as was the offending brute, and very summarily despatched. Such at least was the practice, under the Mosaic code, whenever the fugitive was not protected by a sanctuary. But in estimating the force of all these provisions, it must be observed that we are not warranted to regard them in the light of precise injunctions, even at the time to which they specially belong; the very precept, that alone has the direct form of command, "Be fruitful and multiply," &c., would evidently be pressed quite too hard, were it to be construed as a positive statute, binding like a moral law on the people of that age, and allowing individuals no choice nor discretion in the matter. It is superfluous to say that such a compend of encouragements and of general, but undefined, regulations, is not properly a code, or strictly a body of statutes, either for the time being, or for perpetual obligation.

Were it needful to expose any further the absurdity of the Theocratical plea, we might carry it out, as consisten-

Digitized by Google

cy would require, through all the particulars contained in this address to Noah: wresting the words "Be fruitful," into a positive command, which is known to be disregarded by thousands, and yet our government takes no measures to enforce allegiance; turning the gift of animal food into a Noachic ordinance, against which Grahamism is openly prevailing, and still no Dr. Cheever writes a book to convince us of the impiety; men eat flesh with the blood in it, and our law-makers are suffered to slumber over the offence, though the blood is still the life in the same sense that it ever was; no attempt is even made "to control the legislation and jurisprudence of this great country," so as to secure an express statute to slay every beast that has destroyed human life, though the original reason for the enactment still continues, namely, that man is made in the divine image!

Having thus gone over the ground of what is called the Biblical argument for Capital Punishment, and seen what it amounts to, we here close the examination. There are, indeed, other grounds on which that penalty is advocated, some of them religio-sectarian, and some of them civil: such as the purely retributive or vindicative nature of justice, and consequently of punishment; the equality in the exaction of life for life, as well as of eye for eye and tooth for tooth; the need that human laws should present some example to shadow forth, as far as they can, the final irremediable doom of eternity; the universal dictate of conscience, as gathered from the judgement and practice of men in all ages; the paramount terror that death inspires, and its paramount force, therefore, to deter; and finally, the statistics, which had been alleged on the other side, are said to bear in the contrary direction. But we are content to leave all these defences to the ordeal of time and reflection, if the main question itself be only referred, like other parts of the penal code, to the free disposal of common-sense, guided by observation and experience.

The great evil of the Theocratical hypothesis, is, that it takes the case out of the court in which all other points of civil legislation are settled, and, by interposing the most solemn prohibition on human interference, removes it beyond the reach of all questions of expediency, or of

Digitized by Google

actual effects. We have no more right, on this ground, to inquire into the practical workings of Capital Punishment, with any view towards changing the penalty, than we have to institute a tentative process with a view to set aside the moral laws of God. It is easy to see that if an investigation is even attempted, under a supposed interdict of this kind, it will be one-sided; we might know, beforehand, in what result it would terminate, for men who plead that God has made the infliction of death a sacred and universal ordinance, cannot of course admit that it operates injuriously. They do not, and with their conviction they ought not to, form their judgement of it on a view of its workings; their faith in it rests on what lies much further back,—on the positive command of God; and their piety, their sense of duty, requires that they somehow find its workings to be good. Without impeaching in the least their veracity or their honorable intentions, we must not put full confidence in the statement of facts, nor in the collection of statistics, that is made out under a prepossession so powerful. H: B. 2d.

Article XXV.

The Spiritual Element.

It may be difficult to observe all the rules of logical arrangement, in treating the subject indicated by this title. The writer may sometimes fancy a connection in his thoughts where none really exists. Minds of different culture differ widely in viewing the same theme. To one mind a certain field may seem to embrace the whole ground, while another may range abroad somewhat at random, and attempt to glean from every department.

A serious thought on the problem of existence will convince us that the religious element must hold a large place in our moral nature. How came we into being, and by what power? How are we sustained, and what is our

Digitized by Google

ground of hope and trust? How stand we related to the universe, and what shall be the end of all that is? What are we, and what is our destiny? Questions like these are constantly rising, and constantly baffling the most penetrating inquiries of human reason alone. The understanding may be enlightened by science and philosophy, to assist in meeting the questionings of the soul, yet there are seasons of awe and wonder, when, wrapped up in the mysteries around us, nothing but the exercise of the religious sentiments can save us from despondency. Allowing it possible for a feeling, thinking, reflecting man to become an Atheist, we are unable to conceive any condition of mind more oppressive than his must be, while sensible that there is no light in the universe which can reach beyond his own understanding, no field for faith, no power greater than his own, no infinite Intelligence, nothing superior to the innate properties of matter itself. To such a man there will come seasons of infirmity and weariness, when the light of reason alone grows dim, and reason itself, once so proud and conceited, sinks into night. It is next to insanity for one to set up his own reason as the greatest good man can believe, or trust, or adore; for, great as it is, there are a thousand problems in human consciousness before which it must fall dumb and confounded.

This must appear at a single glance. Whatever science may reveal in the kingdoms of nature, whatever laws it may seem to elucidate, it must at the same time admit the existence of an infinite field, at present wholly beyond its ken. After all the light it may afford, it can accomplish but little towards explaining how and why things are as they are, or as they seem to be; and why we, in our highest attainments, are sometimes left in darkness, sometimes exposed to evils which appear to promise no immediate good, sometimes subject to wants and weaknesses which nothing within the grasp of our own intellect alone can countervail. No man of well balanced mind can ever feel himself entirely satisfied with the present field of his intellectual survey, for even in that field itself he finds innumerable objects too deep and minute for critical understanding,—objects suggestive of many things yet unknown; and beyond the plane of his present view will

Digitized by Google

extend an illimitable realm filled with mysteries which nothing but a Christian faith can penetrate. The geologist may search far into the earth, and classify its strata; yet deeper still is buried a kingdom no human eye can discover. The botanist may dissect the grass-blade, the flower, and point out the office of each property and petal, yet never form the remotest conception in regard to many of the agencies and operations which constitute the arcana of vegetable generation. The astronomer may take the mightiest telescope and sweep through the firmament, discovering world after world, mapping out system after system, peopling star after star with lofty intelligences, revealing glories that dazzle, and wonders that almost confound; yet each sweep of his vision will pass over fields but dimly explored; and, beyond the farthest boundary of thought or telescopic sight, will still stretch an immeasurable universe. The physiologist may anatomize the human body and assign to each organ its function, yet in attempting to re-construct the mysterious mechanism of man, he must own with awe, "We are fearfully and wonderfully made." The metaphysician may classify the faculties and affections of our mental structure; yet, after his science seems complete, each faculty and affection is constantly manifesting itself in some new, unexpected form, each power is developing itself in some way unknown before; and there are hidden sources of sorrow and joy, of hope and despair, of depravity and divinity, which are visible only to the eternal Eye. The philosopher may speculate on nature, and from necessity allow the existence of a deity,—of one at least capable of being reduced to a system of cold, mechanical laws; yet when he stands alone in communion with the glories and grandeurs of creation, with his brow bathed in the air and light of heaven, he must feel the need of a faith in some living Spirit, in whose presence he may bow like a child, saying, Our Father!

The want of actual knowledge to cover an infinite, unexplored field, must be supplied by the religious element. Without a realm for the exercise of faith and the spiritual affections, the highest, the wisest of men have been left unsatisfied. Though gratified to a certain extent in the attainments of science, philosophy, and literature, still they have found themselves wanting. They have grown cold

Digitized by Google

and weary in the ambitious chase after abstract knowledge. Allow that men may stand on the summit of intellectual eminence, yet while they stand there with faces bent down towards the earth alone, in search of its honor or applause, no warm, heavenly light will beam from above; and that giddy eminence may seem more like a polar mountain swept by chilling winds and covered with perpetual snows, than the mount of Zion, radiant with the smile of God, and vocal with sounds of praise and prayer. Hence, many a great man, worn out in the schemes of intellectual ambition, has turned to spiritual things as the only resource left to supply his highest wants. And there are seasons in the heat of the most worldly life, when men long to retire into that spiritual rest which is never found in the arena of secular existence,—seasons of calamity, of grief, when the ordinary sources of wisdom and strength seem to fail, and to leave the human entirely dependent upon the Divine. At the visitation of death, but few are able to resist the solemn appeal made to the religious affections. Then kings and monarchs drop their royalty, and own a God, in the mysterious change which levels the prince with the lowest Lazarus. Statesmen who have long stood unmoved in the fiercest shock of political strife, have grown humble and silent over one of their numbers fallen in death; and in that hour the better elements of the soul, which have survived the conflict of warring interests, become awakened anew. The words of a distinguished citizen[1] will be remembered as a just tribute to religion, as well as to the memory of a noble man: "Political or professional fame cannot last forever, but a conscience void of offence before God and men, is an inheritance for eternity. Religion, therefore, is a necessary, an indispensable element to any great human character. There is no living without it. Religion is the tie that connects man with his Creator, and holds him to His throne. If that tie be all sundered, all broken, he floats away, a worthless atom in the universe, its proper attractions all gone, its destiny thwarted.—A man with no sense of religious duty is he whom the Scriptures describe, in such terse but terrific manner, as 'living without God in the world.' Such a man is out of his proper being, out of the circle of all his

[1] Daniel Webster, on the death of the late Jeremiah Mason.

Digitized by Google

duties, out of the circle of all his happiness, and away, far, far away from the purpose of his creation."

But while the Christian religion is receiving, in the abstract, tributes of this character, it finds comparatively few earnest exemplars. The pride of intellect has interposed a formidable barrier against the growth of an humble Christian piety. Men somehow seem to regard it as a compromise of dignity, of independence, of their individuality, to make an acknowledgement of their relations to God and our common kindred. And this acknowledgement may be withheld sometimes in consequence of the weaknesses and abuses of the mass of professed pietiests; and many, on this ground, become ashamed even of the name of religion. But they who thus excuse themselves, might, with equal propriety, attempt to excuse themselves from eating and drinking, merely because there are some who become gluttons and inebriates. It is most likely that those who adopt this excuse, adopt it for the want of a better, or to conceal their love of the sensual rather than of spiritual things. Palsied by wrong attachments, their religious sentiments are slow to appreciate the higher interests and duties relating to their moral natures. It is not going back to the old dogma of total depravity, even to admit that there are many who, in a fearful sense, are still by habit, or by a second, perverted "nature, the children of wrath," "given over to a carnal mind," for a season, or to a state of high-mindedness, which nothing but the divine spirit can change. If there is any thing appropriate in the comparison of our Lord between "the wind that bloweth where it listeth," and the operations of the holy spirit in the work of regeneration, why must we not allow that man needs a peculiar change, and that there is something divine, if not supernatural, in the perfecting of this new birth? If man is left to work out his spiritual salvation entirely alone, then we may grant that the work is wholly human, dependent upon finite agency, and within the sphere of what we usually denominate natural operations. But must we not acknowledge that, in the very exercise of godly sorrow for sin,—in the exercise of a grateful, humbled heart before God,—in the exercise of praise, and of prayer for grace and wisdom, man is placed in communication with supernatural influences, or influ-

Digitized by Google

ences not originating in himself? It is true, created in moral affinity with God, all the elements upon which these divine influences are to act, are within his soul, and all these elements are to exert an active agency as indispensible to spiritual perfection; yet while we acknowledge the agency of a supreme Intelligence, a personal Divinity, supreme over the personality of man, we must also acknowledge the work of Christian regeneration as effected only in peculiar coöperation with God.

This view, however, is virtually repudiated by much of the moral and intellectual philosophy of the times. A species of spiritualism is current, which makes human agency next to supreme. It deifies the individual soul, and comes near making God and the universe subject to the power, the dignity, of human nature. Its veneration is more for man than for God, or for God only through man, rather than through Jesus Christ; instead of exalting God as the great source. It leaves man to make his own everlasting destiny. He must draw all the light he needs from his own internal consciousness; for the divinity of his own nature within, can reveal more than the God without. Man has all within him that he needs, and he needs only to call it out, to be a saint or an angel complete.

Now, as much as we venerate man for his capabilities, we are unwilling to encourage an idolatry, which, in our judgement, is calculated to foster too much pride of self, and self-dependence. The doctrine of total depravity weakens man's reliance upon himself; this weakens his reliance upon God. It may encourage a conceit of his own sufficiency, without that consciousness of his liability to err, which he needs in order to keep him ever watchful over himself,—without that consciousness of his wants and weaknesses, which he needs to bring him into the humility of prayer, and to open his soul in communion with the Father. This philosophy may seem preferable to that which represents man a mere machine, propelled by "irresistible grace;" yet *neither* embraces the true view of our spiritual relations and dependences. Man is the created, the finite; God the uncreated, infinite. Man must occupy a position of dependence; it is true, in part dependent upon his own powers, yet essentially, and in

Digitized by Google

the whole upon God; since God is the prime author of all powers and agencies. While men are earnestly entreated to "work out their own salvation, with fear and trembling," they are encouraged by the assurance that "God works in them both to will and to do." There is a coöperation between the human and divine agencies. And yet while the human becomes subject to the divine, there can be no denial of human accountability. But here we are encroaching upon a field of investigation beyond our present design, and, as we may remark in passing, one in which men have long reasoned without much light. Logic, without religious faith, can never clearly elucidate this theme, from the fact that it embraces nothing short of the eternal Mind. The view of regeneration already taken, here becomes confirmed, and assists us in reconciling the apparent conflict between finite and infinite agencies.

In assuming the ground before us, however, it may be objected that man is left in a passive condition. But it may be remarked in reply, that while he is thus placed dependent, in this very dependence he is made the noblest in spiritual heroism and strength. Paul was the strongest while he felt the weakest in himself. Recognizing his relation to God, through Jesus Christ, he lost sight of all that was merely human, and laid hold upon the divine. In his subjection to the Father, Jesus himself became triumphant and glorified. The Christian's loftiest eminence is in the lowliest humility of prayer and communion. And this lowly, dependent attitude requires no compromise of the truest human dignity,—no distrust of the powers and capacities of the human soul. Man stands the highest in dignity while standing in a relation that recognizes God as the parent spirit. Instead of distrusting himself, his confidence becomes armed with a supernal strength, as he remembers that within his moral being are energies of godlike nature and activity. It was this religion that made the first Christians mighty in victories over the world. Consecrating themselves as living sacrifices, with perfect assurance of success, they labored as co-workers with God. They regarded the spiritual element as supreme, and inhaled it as their life and power in all things. They wrought wonders and achieved miracles in the name of Heaven. Outward obstacles and elements

Digitized by Google

gave way before the spiritual agency working in them, with them, and through them. With unwavering faith and resistless zeal, they kept themselves in active communication with God, and the kingdom of heaven opened its fields of hope and glory before them. Little, indeed, seem we to realize, by our own experience, the spiritual power and consecration of those lowly yet exalted disciples, who trod the path of the Anointed in conquest and majesty!

In this speculative age, the religion, the piety, the spirituality of which we speak, seems to many minds altogether dreamy and misty. Men are slow to regard it as either personally important or practicable. It is thought to be fit enough for the weak, the credulous, the anchorites, but illy befiting minds of large business habits. Reference has already been made to some of the causes productive of this indifferent and repugnant feeling. And here it remains, perhaps, for even Liberal Christians to make some humiliating acknowledgements of past error. In attempting to correct the abuses of religion, may we not have dropped some unguarded expressions, liable to be misunderstood? In attacking corrupted forms of piety, our course may have seemed like attacking piety itself. Disfellowshipped for our want of faith in prevalent dogmas, some have maintained that no specific faith was necessary to Christian fellowship, but that an outward moral life alone was a sufficient test of spiritual character. In repudiating a false profession of religion, some have repudiated all professions. In condemning a crafty priesthood, some have seemed to condemn the ministry entire, and to treat it as a cunningly devised league of policy and deceit. In rejecting the silly, whining experiences of fanatics, some have rejected all spiritual experiences as nothing but the delusions of an inflamed imagination. In condemning formal prayers, or those of a boisterous, disorderly character, some have condemned all forms of devotion, and have maintained that our best prayers were deeds of justice and benevolence. In attempting to strip religion of its clogs, some have destroyed its life, and left nothing but a spiritless automaton. And we may rejoice in believing that the course thus taken has been followed by the correction of many enormous evils and abuses.

Digitized by Google

But we are now left under the influence of a reaction. The old sects feel it the most, and, over the present dearth of piety, are sending up a wail throughout the land. To them there is just occasion for alarm; for the prospect of renewing the "Revivals" of Edwards, Finney, Knapp, and Maffit, is hopeless indeed. But the result is not wholly unfelt by Liberal Christians. The reaction of a "piety without works" to "works without piety," is now apparent; and though it is hard to say which is preferable, the former or the present state, yet it is unquestionably our duty to labor for the restoration of the desired equilibrium, in the cultivation of a religion combining both the practical and spiritual.

But here we are met by a class of utilitarians, who contend that morality and religion are the same. Before we can admit this, however, some qualifications must be made. No man, we admit, can be religious, in the broadest sense, without being moral; yet a man may lead a moral life, to a certain extent, without being religious. Religion, in its true sense, embraces love both to God and man. One may, in part, recognize his relations towards his fellow man, without recognizing his relations towards God; and hence, prove deficient not only in religion but in morality. A life without definite faith, hope and trust in God, must lack many of the holiest motives and mightiest energies. The soul, the main-spring of all action, must come under the conscious influence of divine truth and love, before the life can become truly divine. And without those influences which religion alone can impart, man must often waver in temptation, must fall into melancholy amidst sorrow and calamity, must shrink from the stern duty which demands heroic sacrifice, and fail in many of the loftiest aims for humanity. The individualism or rather egoism which rejects every thing of a spiritual character, and advocates the need of nothing but speculative truth, reform, and mechanical morality, wanting the element essential to divine life, must soon run itself out, and be followed by the opposite extreme. The reaction may prove dangerous to many, yet it is preferable to a state of religious libertinism. This reaction is already apparent in the return of some minds from this radicalism back into the long venerated forms of pietism, and even into the

Digitized by Google

arms of Romanism. After a while men grow tired of racking the intellect alone in search of laws and explanations for every thing; and if their spiritual affections are not entirely wasted, they are willing at last to seek the aids of faith. Nothing but these aids can save many from the utter darkness of atheism; and even these may sometimes be sought too late. "I cannot believe!" is too often the desolate confession; and, in most cases, it is because the religious element has too long been allowed to slumber, engrossed in worldliness or in lawless intellectual speculation. This is obvious in most cases where there is an entire alienation from Christianity. Many were educated in a religion which enjoined tenets and penances wholly uncongenial with the early affections; and in maturer life these religious restraints are thrown off, in some instances leaving the mind wholly unsettled, and in others leaving it with the theory of a Liberal Christianity. But the theory alone has proved inefficient, and left the spiritual element inactive. Liberal parents, in instances too numerous, have allowed their children to grow up and go out among opposite influences, without a deep culture of those religious affections in the activity of which are formed the most lasting bonds and associations. This evil is now seen and deplored by the body of our people. We are learning that no permanent union or strength or prosperity can appear without a close spiritual compact which shall recognize the agency of a religious element, mighty through God to the resistance of evil and error. We now feel the need of quickening our Christian theory into a Christian life,—an atmosphere in which we are to breathe and live as a part of our being. We need to feel, not only that the walls of our kingdom are fortified with arguments and evidences without, but that the kingdom of heaven is within us, invincible against all outward influences. Why these waverings, these changes, these discouragements, these alienations, sometimes apparent even among Liberal Christians during times of agitation? Let the humble confession be extorted: we must own the lack of spiritual ties to bind, and of religious influences to support and direct,—the lack of a deep-rooted faith, ever reminding us of the presence and power of God,—the lack of interests and affections as sacred as life itself. Let us

Digitized by Google

feel that we are truly born of God and baptized in his spirit, that he has called us to our mission and armed us with his own eternal truth, that, through Christ He is in us and we are in Him, that the earth and heavens are spread out to animate us in the great field of Christian life; and nothing shall daunt our courage, or weaken our confidence, or cloud our hope, or check the invincible heroism of the soul. Such was the religious spirit that upheld the papal power through ages of darkness and corruption; that, in turn, gave Luther a matchless majesty in battling against Rome; that made Cromwell the giant terror of English loyalists, and that landed the Puritans upon that Plymouth Rock which became a type of the Rock of Ages, on which they stood for defence, and against which no human arm could prevail.

There is a growing desire among the better minds of our age, for the developement of a religion capable of being universally adopted, and realized, as the power of God. The religion of the multitude is too sensuous or superstitious; that of worldly men is too formal or theoretical; while many refined, philosophical and literary minds, are left without any, except that which is occasionally suggested by nature. Liberal Christians may here regard their position as peculiarly responsible. The work now before us seems to be, to show that there is a reality in the Christian religion, of the widest practical moment, and that there is a spiritual element in every soul which may be called into an active realization of God. It is said of S. T. Coleridge, that at an early age in his life, he wrote and spoke with severity against the forms of piety, and especially against the act of prayer. But towards the close of his life he retracted his former views, and remarked that the "act of praying was the very highest energy of the human heart,—praying with the total concentration of all the faculties; and he pronounced the great mass of learned and worldly men absolutely incapable of prayer." The editor of Coleridge's "Table Talk" says: "Within two years of Mr. Coleridge's death, he very solemnly declared his conviction upon the subject. I was sitting by his bedside one afternoon, and he fell, an unusual thing for him, into a long account of many passages of his past life, lamenting some things and condemning others, but com-

Digitized by Google

plaining withal, though very gently, of the way in which many of his most innocent acts had been cruelly misrepresented. 'But I have no difficulty,' said he, 'in forgiveness; indeed, I know not how to say with sincerity the clause in the Lord's prayer which asks for forgiveness *as we forgive.* I feel nothing answering to it in my own heart. Neither do I find the most solemn faith in God, as a real object, the most arduous act of the reason and the will. O no! it is *to pray, to pray* as God would have us; this is what at times makes me turn cold to my soul. Believe me, to pray with all the heart and strength, with the reason and the will, to believe vividly that God will listen to your voice through Christ,—this is the last, the greatest achievement of the Christian warfare on earth. O Lord, teach us to pray.' And then he burst into a flood of tears, and begged me to pray for him. O, what a sight was there!"

The burden of Coleridge weighs upon many minds. Little do even the most spiritual realize of the actual presence of the infinite Spirit, in the season of worship and of weariness, of prayer and of toil, of communion and of daily life. With the sensuous world wrapped around us, we walk more by sight than by faith. It is only through the severest struggles of soul that we are able to concentrate our thoughts and affections upon spiritual realities; and then, even in our most lucid moments, our faith is feeble, and the scenes of divine glory are apparently dim and distant.

In our relations as individuals, or as a Christian body devoted to truth, we may remember, in conclusion, that any neglect of spiritual reliance must be followed by a proportionate falling off of interest, of success, of moral power. God will not hold us guiltless in our forgetfulness of Him as the only source. The spiritual laws, by which he governs the universe, bind us to keep in mind our relations as subjects, and our dependence as children. If we fail to draw wisdom and strength from Him, we must droop in our own weakness, and fall with our mission but poorly accomplished. The world with all its advancement will never outgrow the need of that religion which sustained saints and martyrs of old, and gave Jesus the victory. We still need the trust of the patriarch, who

Digitized by Google

stood ready to sacrifice his only son upon Mount Moriah, —the devotion of him whose royal harp sent out the sacred song in the midnight of sorrow,—the faith of him whose vision reached like a ladder to heaven, traversed by angels, —the firmness of the holy sons whose walk was unharmed amid the fiery ordeal of idolatry,—the spirit of him whose ceaseless orisons hushed the lions and laid them tame at his feet,—the fervor of the Gentile apostle before whose armor principalities fell; and still, above all, we need the self-consecration of Him, who in the Father's name commanded all the elements beneath, and in triumph and glory passed beyond the cross. U. C.

Article XXVI.

Sea-Mosses.

Ye miracles of beauty, born below
  The foaming waters that baptize our shore,—
  By gentle hands plucked thence to bathe no more,
What are ye? bud and fruit and flower, that grow,
And, by the mermaids into garlands twined,
  Serve some high festival in caverns deep?
  When gliding water-fairies sink to sleep,
Do ye, too, on your pliant stems reclined,
  Yield to the rocking of the billowy sea,
  And fold your petals tinted wondrously,
As do our Floral treasures when the night
  Drops from the bending skies her gems of dew?
Oh for a glance at all your sisters bright,
  In the dim halls concealed from human view!

So frail, so beautiful, yet nursed in storms,
  Tossed in the giant arms of threatening waves,
Cleaving to battered wrecks and ghastly forms
  To which the watery mass can give no graves;
For lullaby, the shrieking of the blast,
  For bird and bee, the slimy monsters grim,
  Who sport and slumber in the twilight dim,
Where the sun's rays no warmth nor brightness cast!
Doth the sea-shell upon its briny bed
  Utter the plaintive murmuring that we hear
At night-fall, when the rocky verge we tread,
  And gaze upon the waters calm and clear?
Silent in all your loveliness, ye keep
Forever sealed the mysteries of the deep! H. J. L.

Digitized by Google

Article XXVII.

Christian Liberty.

Civil liberty is justly regarded, by the people of this country, as one of the greatest blessings that we enjoy. It secures to us the privilege of thinking and acting according to the dictates of conscience, on all matters pertaining to religion and government, providing we do not interfere with the rights of others. The laws by which this liberty is secured, are based upon two principles; one, the principle of order, the other the principle of equality. Without order in a state, true liberty could not exist, for disorder would lead to perpetual conflicts, and to infringements upon the rights of individuals. But order in a state is not enough, for there may be order without liberty. Order has been a feature in the most iron despotisms that were ever established. The only order that is compatible with liberty, is that which is based upon the principle of equality. In such an order, the rights of each individual are secured. True liberty, then, is liberty to do and enjoy whatever is right. When we say, therefore, that the laws, by which our liberty is secured, are based upon order and equality, it is simply saying that they are based upon our rights. All rights are in harmony, and hence a law which secures our rights will produce order and liberty. I have a right to utter freely and fully my opinions; but I have no right to make false charges against any man. I have a civil right to worship God as I please, or not to worship him; but I have no right to disturb any man in his worship. I have a right to what I earn, but I have no right to the earnings of another man. Nothing can be more obvious than these positions; for unless the rights of all are precisely the same, there is no equality, and of course no true liberty. Just in proportion as any one can infringe upon my rights, my liberty is diminished.

According to these views, liberty can be secured only by the agency of just and equal laws. To be free is not to be exempt from laws, but to be under those which are

Digitized by Google

based upon our rights. There is a vulgar idea of liberty somewhat prevalent, which makes it synonymous with exemption from every kind of restraint. They who have this idea think it a monstrous injustice to be imprisoned for theft and fraud, and cannot understand how a country should be called free, which legalizes imprisonment. They say, that there is no more freedom here, than in the despotisms of Europe; for if a man steals here, he is punished, as he is there! I would not refer to an error so vulgar as this, were it not for the fact, that a similar idea, in relation to Christian liberty, seems to be very rapidly growing into favor. There are numbers who fancy that Christian liberty has no restrictions; that it is greater than all laws and tests, and that it can set at defiance every thing which the world has held as sacred, and yet not transcend its rights. It is boldly maintained, that there can be no limits to Christian liberty; and that the moment any are fixed, we outrage Christian rights, and act the part of tyrannical dictators, and become judges of others! Nothing can surpass the clamor which has been raised because we have adhered, in this age of marvellous discoveries, to the simple doctrine of the New Testament, that faith in Christ as a Teacher from God, specially endowed with wisdom and power, and proved thus by his teachings and miracles, is essential to the Christian character. You will be careful to observe how far these persons go. They do not merely object to human creeds; but they object to any creed whatever. They say, that we have nothing to do with a man's faith; that if his life is right, that is enough. Such is the broad ground occupied by those who are perpetually declaiming against tests. They occupy this ground, not merely with reference to the laity, but with reference to ministers also, and say that we have no right, when a man seeks our fellowship, to ask what he believes; if convinced that he is a good man, that is enough. The bare statement of this position seems sufficient for its refutation; for it would compel us to fellowship, as Christians, men of all opinions. The position is, that we are to have no doctrinal test. Let us examine this, a moment. Here is a man who boldly and positively affirms that there is no God, that the world came by chance, and that it is a mere superstition to suppose

Digitized by Google

that there is an eternal, self-existent, all-wise, all-powerful, and infinitely good Being. There are such men in the world. I have seen men, of this opinion, who were honest, virtuous, intelligent, and deeply impressed with a sense of the value of moral excellence. Abner Kneeland, during the latter part of his life, was a man precisely of this character. Suppose now, that such a man were to come to us, and say, "Gentlemen, I wish to join your ministry. I like your ideas of moral worth; I fully sympathize with you in your views of the moral duties of life; and I think, that I can be useful in laboring with you; will you receive me and announce me, as a Christian minister?" Now if we have no doctrinal test, we cannot refuse his request, but must receive him accordingly. Against his character we can say nothing. For aught that we know, he is as pure as any man in the country. No immorality has ever stained his character; he has ever been just, temperate, humane, and active in doing good. We must then, give him our fellowship, and send him out with our sanction as a Christian minister; and though, wherever he goes, he asserts that there is no God, no omniscient eye perpetually upon us, no infinite Judge to whom we are accountable, no infinite Father in whose arms we are encircled, we must call him our brother in the Lord, and give him the sanction of our name, our learning, our influence, in propagating what we believe to be the most fatal heresy ever broached. All this we must do, if we have no test!

Suppose another case. Here is a man who denies that there ever was such a person as Jesus Christ; who says that he was a mere ideal being, created by the fancy of moral dreamers! Such an opinion has been entertained, and has been advocated with undoubting confidence. Much learning has been brought to sustain it; and a case has been made out, which some have supposed amounted to demonstration. What if one of this character were to ask our fellowship? He admits that the Christ of fiction was a very good character; that it had some extraordinary traits. He admits also, the excellence of virtue, and contends earnestly for all moral duties; but wherever he goes he denounces what he denominates an idle superstition, and seeks to destroy all confidence in the gospel histories,—calls them forgeries, impositions, unworthy of the

Digitized by Google

least credit. And yet, we must fellowship him, and own him as a Christian minister! This we must do, if we have no test of faith.

Suppose yet another case. Here is a man who believes that there is no inherent difference between virtue and vice; that all the laws in relation to them are purely arbitrary; and that vice of itself is just as good as virtue. In proof of this, he says that what some people call a virtue, others call a vice; that what are vices in one country are virtues in another. The advantages of our actions, he says, arise not from their nature, but from the laws of our country, from our social organizations, from the manners and customs of our people, and the sway of public opinion. One believing thus, and there have been many such, asks our fellowship as a minister of the gospel. He wishes to preach it, not because it is true, not because its moral precepts are true, but because public opinion and the customs of society make it better for people to live as it requires. He is a virtuous man, not because there is a holy God, or a righteous government over the world, or a difference between virtue and vice, but because a virtuous man is more respected, has more friends, gains more favors, exerts more influence, than a wicked man. If Atheism, Heathenism, or Mahomedanism prevailed, he would as soon preach them as Christianity. Truth is nothing with him; all he wants is that which accords with the framework of the society in which he lives, and has the sanction of the prevailing moral sentiment. Now, if we have no doctrinal test, that man must be fellowshipped; and, under our patronage, he must go out infusing his poison into the minds of the people, destroying all the foundations of virtue, and encouraging every secret form of vice which can be imagined, or which is tolerated by public sentiment.

Here, then, are some of the consequences, which would result from having no test. The church would be made up of atheists, deists, infidels of every school! And this would be the church of Christ! And men really seem to be serious in saying, that this would be a desirable state of things! I cannot conceive of an absurdity greater than this, or of an arrangement which would give to every form of error greater power and consequence. Let this ab-

Digitized by Google

surdity prevail, and every advocate of infidelity would find his way to all Christian organizations, and, under their sanction, and sustained by their means, would promulgate his heresies. And Christians could have no defence against infidels, and of course no motive to provide themselves with the means of religious instruction; for any means, so provided, would be just as much for the inculcation of irreligion, as of religion. When they repair to church, they will be as likely to hear a harrangue against the God in whom they believe, against the Saviour whom they have chosen for their guide, against the eternal principles of the moral and religious duties which they feel to be imposed upon them, as otherwise.

A test, therefore, is indispensable. It belongs to the framework of a religious organization, just as much as the terms of a copartnership belong to a company formed for the prosecution of any kind of business. Every organization necessarily implies the existence of individual rights, and in the bond of union those rights must be secured, or the bond is nothing, and the union a fallacy. Hence, if we have no test, we have no conceivable motive for a union. A union presupposes some object to be gained; and the gaining of an object presupposes some plan by which it is to be gained. For instance, men believe in Christianity as a Divine religion; and they associate together for its propagation, for instruction in its doctrines and duties, for growth in its knowledge and virtues. Therefore, to fellowship men, as their teachers, who deny Christianity, who seek the destruction of what they believe, is to defeat their very object, and take away the very motive which led them to associate together. There cannot, then, be an organization without a test, and that test must be according to the object for which the organization is effected.

Perhaps it will be said, this is granted; and, as the true object of Christianity is the promotion of righteousness, the test should be, not doctrine, but character; and that, therefore, any man who is righteous, and who labors to make others righteous, should have our fellowship. Doctrines, it is said are nothing; we do not care what a man believes, if he is a good man, and labors to do good. Let us see how this idea corresponds with the New Tes-

Digitized by Google

tament. St. Paul says, "He that cometh unto God, must believe that he is, and that he is the rewarder of them who diligently seek him." He also says, "Without faith, it is impossible to please him." And Jesus says, "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life; and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him." He also says, "Sanctify them through thy truth; thy word is truth." Here we see, that faith is a matter of consequence, and declared to be indispensable. And who can for a moment doubt this? How can we worship, unless we believe in a God? What motive can we have to obey God, unless we believe that he is a rewarder of all who diligently seek him? How can Christ's character exert over us its religious influence, unless we believe in him as a perfect pattern of all excellence? How can his religion be the law of our lives, unless it is received as the truth of God?

We cheerfully allow that the object of Christianity is to produce righteousness; and that no man has any claim to be called a Christian unless he is righteous. We say emphatically with the New Testament, "He that doeth righteousness is righteous even as he is righteous." "By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another." But these passages are not to be separated from those which declare the necessity of faith: "He that believeth in him is not condemned; but he that believeth not is condemned already; because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God." Here we see, that faith is the cause, and that love, righteousness, is the effect. Hence the apostle James says, "What doth it profit, though a man say he hath faith, and have not works? Can faith save him? Faith, if it hath not works, is dead, being alone." The only evidence of a living faith is a holy life; the life is the fruit of faith. Those, therefore, who exclude faith, because righteousness is declared to be the essential, exclude the cause of righteousness. And the very texts on which they rely are against them. "By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another." Here Christ makes himself the standard. They are to copy him, to have his love. He is their guide. They are to do as he requires. And yet, it is pretended, that a man

Digitized by Google

may be a good Christian who denies the divine existence, who declares Christ to be a fiction, and maintains that there is no difference between the nature of virtue and of vice!

They who deny doctrine, and say it is immaterial whether a man has faith, maintain that mere rules of duty are sufficient. Sufficient for what? we would ask. Who believes that mere rules are enough for any thing? The husbandman may have rules to guide him in tilling his farm; but if there be not, back of these rules, in his necessities, or in the love of gain, some motive-power which prompts him to act, the rules will exert over him no influence. The mechanic may have rules to guide him in his business, but there must be, aside from them, motive-powers for action, or the rules will be a dead letter. The child may have rules to direct his steps, but they furnish no motive to obedience. A rule is merely a guide. If rules are all that is necessary to secure what we desire, I can easily obtain ships and jewels and silks and every thing else I may want. But a man will not build me a ship, or make me a watch, or erect me a house, unless I present him an inducement. It is the same in matters pertaining to religion. Rules are not enough. We must have a motive-power; and that motive-power we find in the doctrines of Christianity. I may give a man rules to seek God, but he will never seek him, unless he believes that God is a rewarder of the obedient. The motives for religious action are to be found in the character of God, the nature of his government, the fitness of his laws to our capacities and condition. Thus the motive-power of religion is not in mere rules, but in its doctrines and principles. This fact shows the necessity of faith; for it is only by faith that the doctrines and principles of Christianity become a reality to the soul, and act upon it.

There is still another point to be considered in connection with the idea under examination. Whence are we to obtain our rules of duty, if the Bible is rejected? If character is to be made the test, there must be a standard of character; and if the Bible is discarded, where shall we obtain that standard? This is an important question. Shall we go to Heathen writings? or shall we go to the Christian Scriptures? You will say, perhaps, go to the

Digitized by Google

latter. But there may be a difference of opinion here. Indeed every man may fix his standard to suit himself. The tippler may say his standard is high enough; the debauchee may say the same of his. Drunkenness and debauchery have both been regarded as perfectly compatible with right, and have been looked upon as innocent indulgences by some of the most polished nations of the earth, — nations too, whose moralists taught some of the highest and noblest moral rules. Suppose now, that a man whose standard is thus low, asks for fellowship, and you object on the ground of moral unfitness; could he not ask, by what right you object? Could he not demand your authority for sitting in judgement upon his conscience? Could he not say, "My moral sense approves of all that I do; I am not conscious of any wrong. Am I not just in my dealings, kind to the poor, and true to my word? And what can you ask more?" In reply you might say, that your standard was higher than his, that your moral sense demanded greater attainments in virtue than he had made. But he might answer, "I deny your standard; it is unauthorized; the general conduct of the world proves it so; it has no sanction in the moral sense of mankind, for they do not generally regard it?" Thus, if we reject the Scriptures, we have no standard, and consequently cannot make character a test.

To all this reasoning it may be replied, "We do not wholly reject the Scriptures. We receive what they teach respecting God's existence, love, justice, mercy and grace; Christ's love, benignity, purity and forgiveness; our duty to God and each other, and an immortal life for the race. On all these points, we believe that the Scriptures teach absolute truth; truth that is eternal, and that meets the highest wants of the soul. We believe this, we regard this as essential; but we reject the miracles, we reject all Supernaturalism." Here let us pause a moment. If, on all these points, the Scriptures teach absolute truth — truth that is essential — then a man cannot be a Christian who rejects this truth. Thus, the very men who cry out so much against a creed, have a creed, and would no more admit that an atheist is a Christian, than we would. They could not; for he rejects their essential truths, their absolute truths, and truths which they say come with the

Digitized by Google

clearness of light, and the force of demonstration. Were a man who rejects these to ask their fellowship, they would say, "Why, you deny immortality, you deny human accountability, you deny the duty of worship, you deny the being of a God; and we cannot endorse you. We do not say, that you are not honest, not a good man, but you reject essential truths." There is not a Rationalist in the land but that would say this. But all, thus treated might reply, "Gentlemen, you boast of religious liberty; you complain because Supernaturalists have a test; you have filled all Christendom with your clamor against tests; and now, you reject me, because I cannot subscribe to your test! You are acting the very part of those against whom you have poured forth your anathemas." And yet, the Rationalist must do this; for were he to give his fellowship to a man who denied all essential truths, the very act would be a monstrous lie; for fellowship is an expression of our confidence in the qualifications of the man to whom we give it, and an endorsement of the general views he is engaged in promulgating. As an honest man, I could not give my fellowship to one engaged in teaching what I believe to be subversive of Christianity; and he who asks me to do it, asks me to act the part of a hypocrite. I would not take the fellowship of such a man, if he should proffer it; for it would be an act of dishonesty, which would prove his fellowship to be utterly worthless.

A test, then, is indispensable; and those Rationalists of our country who have clamored the loudest against a test, have one just as much as any. The Bible, stripped of its Supernaturalism, is that test. The difference then between us is, we own that we have a test, we seek to make no capital by a clamor against one, we contend that a test is the basis of all religious union.

In what, then, you may ask, does Christian liberty consist? I answer, it consists in the liberty to do whatever the test allows. A Christian is not superior to truth; but truth is superior to him. The citizen is not above law, but the law is above him. He has no right to trample upon the law, for if he had, the law would not secure liberty. Christian truth being above the Christian, and being his guide, that to which he is amenable, he cannot, as a

Digitized by Google

Christian, reject it; and the moment he does this, he ceases to be a Christian.

There is a wide difference between *civil* religious liberty and Christian liberty. Religious liberty is guaranteed by our equal laws; it is a liberty to believe, or not; to worship God, or not; to follow Christ, or not; to defend the gospel, or to fight against it. Every man has this liberty, and I would not have it abridged. But Christian liberty is different. As a Christian, I have not the liberty to defame God, to heap contempt upon the name of Christ, or to contend against the gospel. I have the liberty to worship where my conscience dictates; to speak out fully my honest opinions and to interpret the Bible as I think is right; but I have no liberty to act in opposition to the truth. Nothing can be more obvious than this. If we receive Christ as a teacher from God, we have no liberty to refuse his teachings; if we believe that God gave him an authority over us, we have no liberty to disregard his authority. In this, Christianity is not peculiar; it is no more exclusive than the laws of our country. I have no liberty, under these laws, to rob, murder, or steal; because, as we have seen, the laws are based upon the principles of equal rights, and this makes them laws of liberty. Christianity is most emphatically a religion of liberty; but it is so, not because it throws the door wide open for men to follow every form of error and sin; but, because its truths are suited to the highest wants of the soul, its noblest powers, its greatest attainments; because all that it forbids, enslaves and degrades; and because it exalts, ennobles, and purifies, and thus lifts us into the very region of liberty. We have liberty to do every thing that is good and praiseworthy; every thing that is great and noble; and every thing that is calculated to make us happy and useful. And this is true liberty; for while the soul is fettered by error and sin, under the guidance of truth it enlarges itself, and rejoices in freedom. In this liberty there are order and equality. All obey the same Governor, all have the same rules of action, all enjoy the same rights. No man claims authority over his fellow-man; but all bow to the same Lord; and though he may be viewed in different lights, and his word be differently explained, his authority is alike recognized by all; and all equally look to him for guidance and salvation.

Digitized by Google

Some perhaps will say, that this is a restricted liberty, and not compatible with the broad freedom which an immortal soul needs; that a being so great as man, so richly endowed, should have liberty to roam at will wherever he may desire. But such should remember, that the creature is amenable to the Creator, and that he has a right to prescribe our course. Such should remember also, that the course which he has prescribed is the right course, and that when man departs from it, he departs from the right way, and passes into the kingdom of slavery and death. A man might with the same propriety say, the free soul ought to be above the laws of our land, and have permission to do whatever it desires, as to say it ought to be above the gospel. But such permission would be a permission to do wrong, to infringe upon human rights. All just and equal civil laws give permission to do whatever is right, and nothing more. So the divine laws give permission to do whatever is right, and nothing more. They mark out for us a course of the highest happiness, and the greatest advancement; and any one who desires to do what they prohibit, desires that which is wrong; any one who disowns their authority, is under the sway of some false opinion or blinding passion. To deny this is either to deny that God is capable of giving laws that are perfect, or that Christianity is from him. Believing as we do, that Christ was a Teacher who had wisdom and love without measure, that he had divine authority to teach, and that he taught a system of truth of the highest and holiest character, we cannot but look upon every man who denies his authority, who rejects him as God's special messenger, and exalts his own soul above him, as having departed from the truth, and thus from the kingdom of true liberty.

According to these views, Christian liberty is a boon of inestimable value. The Being to whom we are amenable is perfect, and asks only to lead us upward to the highest perfection. He is the God of truth, and he asks only that we should go where truth guides. He is the God of love, and he asks only that we should cherish the faith best calculated to give activity to our highest and holiest affections. While he will be obeyed, or refuse to own us as his followers, it is only because what he prohibits is wrong, and what he demands is right and good. Hence that

Digitized by Google

which many call liberty is not liberty, but slavery; for there is no liberty in error. They who reject Christ are not free, for freedom can be found only in the truth. The Christian, then, is the only free man on earth; and he is indeed free. There is no fetter upon his soul; there is no obstruction in his path of progress. The Master whom he serves leads him ever onward and upward; the truths he believes perfect and enlarge his heart more and more; the desires which he cherishes are all gratified; and his reason responds to every thing which is taught in divine revelation. O. A. S.

Article XXVIII.

Inspiration of the Scriptures.

The subject of the present article has, of late, awakened the attention of many gifted minds of various forms of belief. It has been regarded as important to the religious interests of mankind, to ascertain the true nature of inspiration, so that when we use the word, or hear it used by others, we may have some distinct and definite conception of its meaning. We believe, that the term is often employed in a manner too vague and indefinite to convey any clear idea to the mind; and we fear, that sometimes it is made to express ideas that have no foundation in truth. These considerations indicate the propriety of discussing this subject, in its various lights and bearings, whenever we may humbly hope that our discussions will contribute, in any degree, to disabuse the mind of erroneous views of religion, and to open the understanding to clearer and more satisfactory perceptions of truth.

What is meant by inspiration? What idea do we mean to express, when we say that the writers of the Scriptures were inspired men? The word, as its etymolo-

Digitized by Google

gy denotes, expresses a breathing into the human soul, of truth, which, by its unaided powers alone, the soul could never reach. This, we believe, is the true sense of the term. And we think that a fair and dispassionate examination of the nature and laws of the human mind, brought into connection with our natural and rational views of God, will satisfy every candid inquirer, of the general correctness of this definition. It cannot be a startling proposition to any reflecting mind, to affirm, that the Author of our being can have access to the soul, which he has formed in his own image, that he can instruct and enlighten it, greatly enlarge and strengthen its faculties, and give extensive scope to its perceptions. Nor will it be considered a very worthy idea of God, to suppose that his communications must always be confined to such means as we may feel able readily to explain, or to the common processes of nature, or to the ordinary teachings of providence. It would be strange, indeed, if the Fountain of intelligence could not act upon our limited intellectual powers, by other methods than those which come within our reach, or are familiar to our philosophy. When, therefore, we are asked how the Infinite communes with the finite spirit? or how the Divinity acts upon humanity? or how the communication of truths, which could in no other way be learned, is made to the soul? we may answer, we cannot tell; nor is it necessary that the precise process should be explained. There are many facts, of infinitely less consequence than this, that are known only as facts, while a full explanation of the manner of their production, has never been given. Reasoning is often at fault. Theories of cause and effect are frequently fallacious. Why, then, should we doubt, that the Creator of the human soul, and the Giver of all its powers, is able to communicate to it truths, of which it would otherwise remain ignorant? And is it not unreasonable and unphilosophical, to raise an objection to inspiration, on the ground of our ignorance of the mode of divine influence?

But here, it should be observed, that when we speak of inspiration, with a belief in its reality, we necessarily, associate it with the idea of its importance to the religious interests of man; and this association is of great utility, as it helps to clear the subject of some peculiar difficul-

Digitized by Google

ties. The notion, that God would ever employ, any extraordinary, or supernatural, means of communication, without adequate reasons, or such as may be found in the character, or mental circumstances, of man, is certainly unworthy of the Divine Being, and leads directly to enthusiasm or fanaticism. To cherish this notion would be to open the way to the most visionary and extravagant theories of religion, that have ever been broached. On the other hand, if there have been instances, in which the circumstances of the human race evidently required communications from above, superior to any that are derivable from nature, or from the common operation of the intellectual faculties, we shall run into an extreme no less to be avoided than the one just mentioned, if we suppose that such communications could be withholden. And if occasions can be shown to have existed, on which the condition of the world, or of a great part of the world, evidently required some more extraordinary and more impressive manifestations of truth, than nature, the ordinary events of providence, and the unassisted reason of man can furnish, we are then authorized to believe, that the Deity would make them; as such manifestations would be expressions of his paternal, benevolent character.

It is true, that, of the moral necessities of mankind, and of the fitness of times, for supernatural communications, divine wisdom alone can best decide. Yet though we are not able to judge correctly of the suitableness of the times for such communications, may we not perceive their adaptation to the circumstances of certain periods in the history of our race, when they have been made? This is all that we can attempt to do. If "the world, by its own wisdom, knew not God," even after ages had passed in making the experiment, we should consider supernatural communications happily adapted to the period in which the inefficiency of human reason was most strikingly manifest. But waiving this consideration, for the present, let us inquire further, if there be not, in every reflecting mind, a kind of moral instinct, that spontaneously calls for something more, in relation to its supreme interest, than it finds within itself, or in the ordinary lights which guide the mind in subordinate concerns? Does not the soul look up with an earnest longing for some spiritual

Digitized by Google

good, which cannot be obtained by the unaided exercise of its natural powers? We are compelled to answer these questions in the affirmative. To us it seems that nature cries out, and lifts her hands to the living God, for light, and truth, and love, which come not from material sources, nor can be received except by special communication. To us it appears, as if a voice came forth from the deepest recesses of the soul, for that which it has not, and knows not where to obtain. This may be an indefinable desire, it may be somewhat like the instinct of the unconscious babe, which impels it to ask, in the only way in which it can ask, for the nutriment on which it subsists. But as no instinct is deceptive; as the author of our being has directed every desire towards the object that is intended to satisfy it, why is it unreasonable to believe, that this inward craving of spiritual good, through extraordinary, supernatural instrumentalities, shall be satisfied?

We may now be asked, what circumstances would appear to indicate the need of a supernatural communication? or, in other words, to what occasions we may reasonably suppose the benevolent God would adapt such a communication? To this we reply, that the Scriptures show that inspired men spake whenever the ignorance and depravity of the times seemed to require this manifestation of the divine agency, this extraordinary and supernatural method of announcing salutary truths. We state this fact, as it stands in the Bible, in connection with the remark, that this view of the case accords with what we should have expected, if we might be supposed competent to judge of the fitness of the season for a new and special display of divine wisdom and goodness. If we looked for it at all, it would be when men were sunk in ignorance and depravity, when it might be truly said of them, "the whole head is sick, and the whole heart faint;" when, "from the sole of the foot to the crown of the head there was nothing but wounds, bruises, and putrefying sores;" when, though "the ox knew his owner, and the ass his master's crib, yet Israel did not know, God's people did not consider." It would be when "iniquity abounded, and love waxed cold," when men forgot their Maker and God, trampled upon his authority, rejected his counsels, despised his proffered mercy, renounced his service,

Digitized by Google

and doubted, or denied his existence. It was at such times, that "holy men of God spake as they were moved by the holy spirit." It is when men have become thoughtless, stupid, and abandoned to wickedness; when their minds are insensible to the ordinary teachings of providence; when their hearts are callous to every good impression, that they need to be roused to a sense of their condition, by extraordinary means. And the employment of such means is, at once, a proof of the wisdom and benevolence of God, and is in perfect harmony with his dealings in other departments of his works.

We have thus attempted to explain and illustrate the general idea of inspiration. We have supposed, that the Infinite Intelligence may act upon the finite mind by mysterious agencies, acquainting it with truths of which it would otherwise continue ignorant; and that such communications have been sometimes requisite, as the only means of rousing senseless and wicked men to a perception of their depraved and dangerous condition. We have said, that this view of the subject implies nothing derogatory to the divine character, nothing unreasonable, or incompatible with sound philosophy. We have not discussed the question, whether inspiration be, in a strict sense, a suspension, or violation, of the laws of nature, or of the mind, or only a developement of some laws of which we are ignorant. It is sufficient to our present purpose, that inspired communications are to be regarded as deviations from the usual course of things. This, we think, fully meets the demands of the subject, which requires only that inspired communications should be of such a character as to prove instrumental in the enlightenment and reformation of the ignorant and wicked, when all other means have failed.

We shall now proceed to the consideration of our subject, under another, and no less important aspect. We shall take into view the ideas that are entertained of the inspiration of the Scriptures. The Bible is generally denominated an inspired book, the word of God. There are those who contend for what they call the *plenary* inspiration of the Scriptures. This form of expression has sometimes appeared to demand a clearer and fuller explanation than it has always received. The term,

Digitized by Google

plenary, ought to be clearly defined, before we acquiesce in the theory which the term is used to distinguish. We suppose that most Christians, who have not critically investigated the subject, believe that all that we find in the Scriptures, is inspired truth. The language which many use certainly implies this; and frequently we hear the assertion made, in opposition to those who maintain a different opinion. If the Swiss theologian, Gaussen, may be taken as the representative of that class of Christians who profess to believe in the inspiration of every sentence and word of the Bible, then we need look no further for a definition of the term, on which so much is made to depend. But with the theory of this writer we have no sympathy. We consider it absurd and extravagant, and rather adapted to make infidels, than to produce a rational and well-founded belief in the inspiration of any part of the Scriptures. There are those who, rejecting this theory, admit that all the Scriptures, under the providential direction of the Almighty, have been preserved from remote ages to this day; and that they contain a history or record of God's dispensations, together with some truths which could be known only by the special communication of the divine spirit. They suppose, that the whole of these writings is adapted to human improvement, or, in the language of Paul, "is able to make men wise unto salvation." But they, who entertain this view of the subject, do not believe that all portions of the Bible are alike inspired. They argue that no such claim is advanced by any of the writers of the Scriptures. The Bible, we know, describes numerous characters. Some of the persons whose histories it contains were wise, others foolish; some were virtuous, others wicked; some are allowed to have uttered sacred truths, while others are charged with declaring egregious falsehoods. Here are distinctions, founded in the nature of things. And are we to believe that all that those persons are said to have spoken, was alike inspired by the holy spirit? When that allegorical character, the serpent, said, "Ye shall not surely die," was his declaration inspired? When Peter, alluding to his Master's prediction of his approaching sufferings and death, exclaimed, "far be it from thee, Lord, this shall not happen unto thee," did he utter the promptings of the holy

Digitized by Google

spirit? You may say, that these things are recorded as warnings, and may serve to guard us against the power of temptation. But this is a very different thing from asserting the inspiration of these portions of Scripture.

We are pleased to find, that our own view of the nature and extent of inspiration agrees so nearly with that of others, who have written on the subject, particularly with that of the writer of an article which has appeared in a past number of this periodical.[1] While we admit the reasonableness and the fact of inspiration, we avow our belief in its limitation to doctrines, and truths, which were above the ken of unaided reason, and which, of course, could be known only by extraordinary communication from the Infinite Spirit. Inspiration has no concern with truths, or facts, that are open to the cognizance of every mind endued with ordinary sagacity, or that may be proved by inductive reasoning, or that lie within the bounds of daily experience. Least of all, do we believe that inspiration is employed in writing, or speaking, of comparatively trivial, secular affairs, in which every man's common sense is, or ought to be, a competent guide. It would, we conceive, be an indignity to inspiration to suppose it to be employed upon such subjects. We will now endeavor to ascertain how far these positions are sustained by the language of the writers of the Scriptures.

The writers of the Four Gospels wrote as historians. Luke commences his history in these remarkable words: "Forasmuch as many have taken in hand to set forth in order a declaration of those things which are most surely believed among us, even as they delivered them unto us, who, from the beginning, were eye-witnesses, and ministers of the word; it seemed good to me also, having had perfect understanding of all things from the very first, to write unto thee in order, most excellent Theophilus, that thou mightest know the certainty of those things wherein thou hast been instructed." This language is that of a person of veracity, who wished, and who thought himself qualified, to give a true account of events and circumstances of the highest importance. Luke desired to give his honorable friend a statement of the facts which occurred in the life of Jesus, together with the doctrines he

[1] See Universalist Quarterly for October, 1848.

Digitized by Google

inculcated. Others, it appears, had undertaken the same task. There were, then, many professed histories of Christ, some doubtless authentic, others perhaps apocryphal, or spurious. Luke had not been one of Christ's personal followers. Hence, his narration was founded on the testimony of other persons, "who, from the beginning," from the commencement of the ministry of Jesus, "were eye-witnesses and ministers of the word." The Evangelist claims nothing more than is here expressed. He puts the credibility of his history on the evidence of competent witnesses, who could not easily have been deceived, and could have had no motive to deceive others. But his language is not that of authority. He does not demand the belief of his friend, on the ground of the inspiration of his narrative. He introduces his account to the notice of his reader just as any historian, who meant to write simple truth, would preface the body of his work, mentioning his principal authorities, and stating generally the evidence on which its veracity depended, and which he considered unimpeachable.

If any should object to the views presented above, let them show, if they can, why a man of the artless character, and honest simplicity, which distinguish the writers of the Gospels, could not furnish a faithful and true narrative of the life and ministry of Jesus, founded on what, in other cases, would be considered competent testimony, without the aid of inspiration, as well as to write any other true history, while destitute of such assistance.

Again. A case is presented in the writings of Paul, in which he not only does not profess to be inspired, but in no very equivocal terms disclaims acting as an inspired man. We allude to his decision on the subject of marriage. It appears, that the Corinthian church had proposed the question to the apostle, whether, in the then existing state of things, it were proper, or prudent, for unmarried persons to form the matrimonial connection. In reply to this question, Paul recommends a state of celibacy. "Concerning virgins," he says, "I have no commandment of the Lord; yet I give my judgment, as one who hath obtained mercy of the Lord, to be found faithful." And again, "I speak this by permission, and

Digitized by Google

not of commandment." It is unnecessary to dwell long upon these passages. They require but little comment. It is sufficient to observe, that giving one's judgment in any case is very different from deciding a question by the authority of inspiration. The two cases cannot be considered identical. The language, used to describe the one, cannot, without manifest perversion, be employed to express the other.

If it is unphilosophical to ascribe the production of an effect to more or to other causes than will rationally account for it, it is equally so, to ascribe to inspiration what may as well be known by the common exercise of the human faculties. We have heard it remarked, by way of objection to these sentiments, that a person, who uses a glass to discover distant objects, can also perceive those that are near him. The remark was doubtless thought to possess something of the nature of illustration and argument. But it is poorly adapted to either purpose; for it is absurd to say, that a person perceives an object by the *aid* of a telescope, when he can see it as well without the instrument.

That there are discrepancies in the historical portions of the Scriptures, no intelligent reader will feel prepared to deny. Some of them may, possibly, be attributed to the ignorance, or carelessness, of the translators; while some may be reconciled with each other, and with fact. But there are others, which, we think, are irreconcilable, especially on the principle of *verbal* inspiration. When we read in 2 Kings, viii. 26, that "Ahaziah was twenty-two years old, when he began to reign;" and again, in 2 Chronicles, xxii. 2, that "Ahaziah was forty and two years old, when he began to reign," we know that both the records cannot be true. There is a mistake somewhere. Either the original writer of one of the records, or some transcriber or translator, was in fault. We do not believe, however, that this, or any other discrepancy, materially affects the credibility of the Gospel, or ought to weaken our faith in the inspiration of those Scriptures, whose subjects, though not *contrary* to reason, are still far *above* its loftiest flight. It is a pleasing reflection, that though we may not be able to reconcile some discrepancies that appear in the writings of the Four Evangelists, in relation

Digitized by Google

to the circumstances attending the death and resurrection of their Lord, yet those very discrepancies prove, that they did not act in concert to deceive their readers. There was no collusion between them; for then, their accounts would have been precisely the same. Perfect *verbal* agreement is not always a certain evidence of veracity, but frequently quite the reverse. E. T.

Article XXIX.

John Foster's Letter on Endless Punishment.

A Letter of the celebrated John Foster to a young Minister, on the Duration of Future Punishment: With an Introduction and Notes, consisting chiefly of Extracts from Orthodox Writers, and An Earnest Appeal to the American Tract Society in regard to the character of its publications. Boston: Phillips, Sampson, & Company. 1849. 12mo. pp. 119.

At this late day, there is no occasion to speak of the manner in which Prof. Crosby (for the editor's name is no longer a secret,) has performed his part of this work. It is, however, a gratification to us to join in the commendations which, we believe, reviewers of all creeds have either tacitly or expressly bestowed on his candor, Christian spirit, and gentlemanly tone; and we have much pleasure in acknowledging the good taste, as well as the skill, with which he has selected and illustrated his Extracts, so as to give Foster's Letter a proper back-ground. It is remarkable, too, how thoroughly a few testimonials and facts, that he has presented, clear away the false shades which some had endeavored to throw over the avowal of the English divine. But our remarks will be directed chiefly to the Letter itself.

Mr. Foster says that he has not read largely on the question of the eternity of future punishment, and he intimates that he has never felt the need of so doing. He moreover confesses that his difficulties with that doctrine do not arise from the force of incidental passages and expres-

Digitized by Google

sions in the Scriptures. It is the moral enormity of the naked idea itself, its injustice and cruelty, that renders its acceptance impossible with him. His presentation of this one point, we have rarely if ever seen equalled for truthfulness, and for the power of conviction with which we should think it must work on reflecting minds. No declamation, no thought of an attempt at rhetorical force, no appeal to passion or sympathy; he is intent only on realizing the idea itself, and bringing it home to the moral sense. The fault of most people with respect to this subject, is, that they talk of eternal punishment without even trying to form a conception of what eternal punishment would be. It is a phrase they use for its Orthodoxy and current repute. They employ it indefinitely to denote some terrible fate hereafter, and that is all; or, in many cases, to signify only future retribution. To deny it, is, with many, to deny future retribution; the two expressions are about synonymous in their minds, the one suggesting to them no more than the other. But, think of a soul "wearing out the ages of the sun, moon, and stars," in torment, damned for as many such awful periods as it lived seconds here on earth, and still no nearer the close of its punishment; think of it suffering on through immensities of duration that revolve only to begin again; bearing its immortal anguish into those remote depths of futurity where the last struggling effort of human imagination gives way, and yet the same drear eternity of pain before it as ever; all, for a momentary sin, committed by a creature that "was made subject to vanity," and in a world of such overcoming temptations as to have drawn all the race astray. Place this idea clearly before the mind, and the moral sense of man absolutely repels it as the height of injustice. A person may indeed put his moral sense under ban, out of deference to what he thinks a revealed fact; he may refuse to listen to it, or stifle it by sophisms; but every time the real idea of eternal punishment comes fresh before him, his heart denies its justice, to say nothing of its goodness. There is not an element in it that our nature recognizes as justice; and the truer, the less perverted our moral sentiments are, the more loudly they cry out against such an infinitely disproportionate infliction. When a man professes to see the

Digitized by Google

justice of God in eternal damnation, it is time to tell him, in charity, that he knows not "whereof he affirms;" for were his moral vision really so depraved, might we not say so demonized, he would be a monster of which humanity has as yet furnished no examples. The idea of justice never exists without that of proportion, *equity:* and, in our moral consciousness, it is always distinct from unmerciful vindictiveness. To call that, justice, which disregards proportion or equity, and is purely vindictive, is only to transfer a sacred term to a diabolical spirit. Mr. Foster expresses the spontaneous language of the law that God has written in our hearts: "Endless punishment! hopeless misery, through a duration to which the enormous terms above imagined will be absolutely nothing! I acknowledge my inability (I would say it reverently,) to admit this belief together with a belief in the Divine goodness,—the belief that 'God is love,' that 'his tender mercies are over all his works.'"

It is sometimes attempted to make out the justice of eternal punishment on the ground that sin is an infinite evil, and therefore deserving of infinite punishment. It is committed against an infinite Being, and, for this reason, (such is the plea,) it must be infinite in its nature. We are surprised that this dialectic quibble should have retained credit among grave divines; not, however, on account merely of its utter groundlessness, but on account of its obvious implications. Let us ask, Is obedience, that is exercised towards God, infinite, also? We are told, No; it has no merit at all. Very well. But sin, committed against him, is infinite? Yes. Then what is the principle, set up in this case? Why, that what conforms to God, and resembles him, is finite, if it be not a mere nothing; but what is opposed to God, is infinite. Is not this an instance of that "wisdom of this world which cometh to nought?" If sin were infinite, because committed against an infinite Being, it is seen at once that there would be no degrees in sin. All violations of God's law, whether slight or aggravated, whether casual or studiously protracted, are precisely the same, are infinite; are infinite in precisely the same sense, being measured only by the nature of God against whom they are committed; and they must have precisely the same

Digitized by Google

punishment. We need say no more on this flagrant absurdity.

Another ground resorted to for the purpose of justifying eternal punishment, is, that men will eternally continue to sin; and therefore they will eternally deserve to be punished. As this is new ground, standing by itself, and opposed in every point to the old ground, it may be well to see what its bearings are. A vulgar proverb warns us not to leap from a dilemma, even though it be quite uncomfortable, till we have cast a look at the one into which we shall fall. We ask, Is the eternal punishment, here proposed to be justified, for the sins of this momentary life? 'No,' it is answered; 'it might be unjust on that ground.' What is it for, then? 'Why, for sins to be committed hereafter, *in perpetuum;* and it is undeniably just that the sinner should be punished as long as he sins.' Certainly. What is the doom of eternal punishment, pronounced at the great Judgement Day, for? for sins not having then occurred, but to be committed subsequently? And is this the way of justice? It should be remembered that the fact of eternal punishment stands, in the popular theology, on the fact that it is the sentence which will be pronounced at the Judgement Day. We press the question, Is it the way of pure justice to inflict penalty for prospective guilt? We press another question, too: The proof-texts, that are referred to such a Judgement Day, and quoted as the only authority for any doom of the kind,—is this the way they read, namely, that the offenders are then to be condemned, not for what they shall have done, but for what they shall subsequently do? The inconsistencies now barely mentioned, are fundamental in the hypothesis, if we understand the case. Let the advocates take counsel on these points, while we proceed. Be it observed, that the argument under consideration supposes that eternal punishment, for the sins only of this life, would be unjust; for the argument is constructed for the express purpose of resting the justification on the perpetuity of sin, so as to avoid the objection that had arisen on the old ground. In fact, the very proposition that such punishment is for the endless continuance of sin, removes the future claim of justice from the sin of this temporary state, seeing that new offences will be requisite to perpet-

Digitized by Google

uate its hold. On this, Foster well remarks: "Suppose the case to be so,—that is to say, that the punishment is not a retribution *simply* for the guilt of the momentary existence on earth, but a continued punishment of the continued ever aggravated guilt in the eternal state; the allegation is of no avail in vindication of the doctrine, because the first consignment to the dreadful state *necessitates a continuance of the criminality;* the doctrine teaching that it is of the essence, and is an awful aggravation, of the original consignment, that it dooms the condemned to maintain the criminal spirit for ever. The doom to sin as well as to suffer,—and, according to the argument, to sin *in order* to suffer, is inflicted as the punishment of the sin committed in the mortal state. Virtually, therefore, the eternal punishment is the punishment of the sins of time,"—which the argument itself supposes to be unjust. Such is the self-condemnation in which it ends, after giving up the old absurdity of the infinity of sin, together with the justice of eternal punishment on that ground, and incurring the new absurdity of making the doom of the Judgement Day rest on prospective offences, and thus losing all hold on the only texts of Scripture to which it appeals as proof of that event.

Nor does the supposition of various degrees of intensity in eternal punishment relieve the idea at all of its injustice. Call off the mind from the business of arranging different degrees therein, (for this effort at contrivance naturally turns the attention away from the revolting principle that underlies the whole;) look steadfastly into the duration of eternity, try to conceive of an absolute eternity of pain, with whatsoever varieties of intenseness,—all, for the sin of this brief life of temptation; and its atrocious injustice presses on the moral sense, as ever. Every sentiment of rectitude within us cries out, It cannot be! No matter in what form, no matter on what ground, we propose endless punishment, it still is an eternal penalty for a temporary offence; and, therefore, as infinitely disproportioned to the sin, as eternity is disproportioned to time. There is infinite injustice in it.

Mr. Foster refers to the known limitations with which the Scriptures frequently use the terms, *everlasting*, *eternal*, *for ever*, &c.; and adds, "My resource in the present

Digitized by Google

case, then, is simply this: that since the terms do not necessarily and absolutely signify an interminable duration, and since there is in the present instance to be pleaded, for admitting a limited interpretation, a reason in the moral estimate of things, of stupendous, of infinite urgency, involving our conceptions of the Divine goodness and equity, and leaving those conceptions overwhelmed in darkness and horror if it be rejected, I therefore conclude that a limited interpretation is authorized." That is, he does in this case, what all Christians are obliged to do in their controversies with the Jews respecting the "everlasting" institution of the Mosaic ceremonies. And we will observe, here, if any one wishes to see the original of all those criticisms, rebukes and warnings, that have been so liberally dealt out to us, on these vexed terms, let him turn to the side of the Jewish attacks on Christianity, and he will see that our divines have added nothing to the ingenuity, sanctimonious airs, and crookedness, of the Rabbis. We will also observe, that the ground on which Mr. Foster meets what is called the Biblical objection, though narrow, is quite sufficient for the purpose he had in view. But had he made that critical examination of the Scriptures on this general subject, which he confesses he had not done, he would have found them far more clear on the side of equity and goodness, than he seems to have suspected.

It cannot be unreasonable to wish that the reflecting part of the religious community would give this Letter of Mr. Foster a candid perusal, and weigh the considerations, incomplete as they are, which it presents. The subject is unquestionably one of greater moment than almost any other that theology itself furnishes. The ultimate condition of our race, and the character of the Universal Sovereign, as illustrated in that event of his economy,—these are concerns with which nothing else can compete. The Stoic affectation of indifference, or superiority, to analagous questions, was tried two thousand years ago, and found not to belong to human nature. We shall find it the same proud and empty pretence, if we repeat the experiment. In the case before us, the writer's standing in the Christian church and ministry, the well known depth and earnestness of his evangelical spirit, his

Digitized by Google

rank in intellectual greatness with such men as Robert Hall, and his world-wide fame as a most cautious as well as profound thinker, all demand at least a respectful notice of a conviction which his moral nature forced upon him, in spite of its unpopularity, and which he held through the ordeal of half a century, till his death. It is neither creditable, nor right, to attempt to shuffle it aside, from before the public, as a hasty notion capriciously admitted, a fancy cherished through want of reverence for the Scriptures, a weak conceit of an eccentric mind. No, this will not do, after all the encomiums that have been bestowed, from the same quarter, on John Foster as one of the burning and shining lights of the age. His general Orthodoxy is a guaranty to our Orthodox brethren that they will find nothing offensive to them in his manner of treating the subject. If they cannot conscientiously, or willingly, give it a patient hearing when argued by us, let them listen to his discussion of it, seconded on this point, as he says he is, by a number of (Orthodox) ministers "of great piety and intelligence," in his country, and, as we have good reason to believe, in this country also. H. B. 2d.

Article XXX.

Mrs. Mayo and her Writings.

Selections from the Writings of Mrs. Sarah C. Edgarton Mayo: With a Memoir, by her Husband. Boston: A. Tompkins, 38 Cornhill. 1849. 12mo. pp. 432.

It is difficult, as all must feel, to estimate with strict truth and impartiality the life and character of those with whom we have been intimately acquainted, but from whom we are not yet sufficiently removed by time and that shadowy dimness which time gradually sheds over all that are departed, to enable us to regard them more as objects of history than of a still living love. Affection and habit

Digitized by Google

still hold the balance which belongs to cool, unbiassed judgement. This difficulty, as is truly observed by the affectionate and reverential biographer of the admirable woman whose memoir and writings form the subject of the work now under consideration, is greatly increased by the absence of striking events in her life. With her the usual order of human manifestation seems reversed. It is not by actions, so much as by the spiritual and intangible gleams which we constantly behold emanating from her, that we are to estimate her, for as she more than once in her late correspondence asserts, her life was an "*inward*" rather than an outward one. But however that life may be contemplated, whether in its quiet acts of love and goodness, its sweet and silent forbearance, or its more purely spiritual manifestations, the more carefully we regard it, the more deeply are we impressed with its rare and singular beauty. Unmarked by ostentatious glare or obtrusive dazzle, its modest light beams out through the veil of diffidence and sensitiveness which ever enveloped it, as twilight skies look up through the sleeping wave. So quietly soothing, so softly purifying, we can well understand the meaning of her biographer when he asserts that "she had done more for his soul than all others." And we regard it as peculiarly happy both for her and for us, that the beautiful task of daguerreotyping her pure nature devolved upon one thus capable of feeling its benignant influence—such a one alone being fitted for it. We also believe with him that "the affections are the only faithful reporters of the secrets of *her* character," however insufficient in practice that rule might prove in many other cases. A deeply loving spirit only could appreciate hers—a deeply loving spirit only could reveal its beauties to others.

Born and nurtured as was Mrs. Mayo in the retirement and seclusion of "the quietest of country villages," unaccustomed to general society, and with few advantages for education other than those furnished by a common district school, we know not which most to admire and wonder at, her graceful and self-possessed, though timid, manner, or the varied acquirements and fine perceptions of which, even in her earliest womanhood, her mind was so singularly fertile. It was a fountain of all sweet thoughts and

Digitized by Google

feelings, whose overflowings went out to delight and charm, and whose ever-living springs of love and sympathy were perpetually welling up in praise to God and good will to all his creatures.

It is the fashion with many to speak of those gifted and nurtured like her as "self-educated." But how narrow is the thought! They are educated by the sublimest and greatest of teachers,—by God, nature, and their own souls. From these they are filled with those great lessons of beauty and goodness and truth, by which they afterwards make the world happier and better. It was thus with Mrs. Mayo; and happy in her faculty of imparting to others what God had taught to her, nothing which she learned was lost. The scenes of her earlier life are filled with those pictures which speak to us through the senses, but which are perhaps not less instructive than her later intimations, when the wealth of her own deep and loving being was mingled with, and modified by, the lore of the schools. Her images of nature are distinct and familiar; the colors are laid on with a soft and gentle hand, and generally with much delicacy of taste, while the peculiar tone of her poetic spirit often sheds over all the holy light of religious enthusiasm. She sees God in every thing above and around her, and therefore every thing is in her eyes significant and holy. She is her own "Eda," after that Eda has found her soul.

In many an early sketch, fresh with the dews of her young nature, she leads us forth with her in her daily walks into the shady dell, the "old pathless woods," or by the musical waters of her favorite "Bow-Brook;" there she exhibits to us the lovely and harmonious pictures she is herself accustomed, with so much quiet joy, to contemplate; with a beguiling sweetness she gradually lures us into the same holy and gentle trains of thought she herself so habitually indulges, communicating even to the most obtuse, something of the same exquisite but calm enjoyment of rural sights and sounds which filled her own pure spirit. She has an eye alike for the gorgeous cloud which adorns the sunset, and the tiniest flower that springs at her feet; and she repeats to us the lesson which each has taught her with such clearness, sweetness and precision, that they are at once as deeply impressed upon our own hearts

Digitized by Google

as upon hers. Never is she more delightful, never more instructive than when alone with nature and "Nature's God," because never was she happier than at such times. For this there was a peculiar reason. Her religion, which with her was not a mere careless appendage, but a part of her very being, taught her to contemplate God as her loving Father, "Nature as one great image of Divine benignity," and all the creatures that move and breathe, as objects of all-comprehensive Divine and human sympathy. To these beautiful and sublime truths her whole heart and soul were attuned. Every vision of her imagination, every creation of her fancy, whatever might be its clothing form, and every outgushing of her pure and loving spirit, was an echo, a variation of this grand and glorious thesis. And this brings me to a point which has been much dwelt upon.

Mrs. Mayo wrote much, some have thought too much, upon the passion of love. How could it have been otherwise? How could a creature made up of such ever-outreaching sympathies, such bright and ardent imaginings, such pure but impassioned dreamings, such an instinct for the beautiful and the good, and withal such an almost seeming incapacity to believe in aught like evil—one who beheld "love," "love," written by the finger of God on every thing around and within her,—fail to make that principle an ever recurring theme? In the beautiful language of her biographer, her nature "can be expressed by no other word than that which was always upon her lips—Love. Love for every thing great and good and beautiful;—Love for these qualities so intense, that it could separate them from the repulsive union with gross affections in which they are too often found in human character;—Love so disinterested, that her life was always more in the wants and sympathies of others, than in herself; flowing out, not only in the form of benevolence and kindness, but of confidence in man, and a willingness to impart the richest treasures of her heart, to bless the humblest one about her;—rising like a constant hymn of praise to the Father of love, and giving to every act of life an unconscious grace and sanctity caught from a converse with spiritual realities—this is the beginning and the end of her character." "She loved, because she could not

Digitized by Google

help it, and with the whole force of her being." And in her own language, "Where the revelations of the spirit are beautiful, I must love. If I meet with sympathy from hearts that are susceptible to every touch of divinity abroad in this glorious world, how can I repay them, but by earnest and undoubting affection." And again, "I do not know who has most to be thankful for, you or I; but this I do know, that we are both exceedingly rich. We are rich because we love and are beloved: what more do we ask?" With so loving a nature, we repeat, how could one fail to make love a perpetual theme? And with so simple and religious a nature, how could that love fail to be pure and natural in its expression? With Mrs. Mayo it was eminently so, and if in her earlier writings it at times lacked somewhat of that dignity with which her maturer judgement would have endowed it, it was a fault which after years and experience corrected. The true, loving nature needed no correction.

It is by perpetual and unperceived gradations that this mysterious being is developed. The mind, as existence progresses, exhibits many new and varying phases. With Mrs. Mayo's, each new phase it assumed was ever brighter and more beautiful than the preceding. Hitherto we have contemplated her in her earlier literary career. Soon the wisdom of the schools came in, and blended with, but never perverted, the charming simplicity and naturalness of her character. In this as in all things else she remained true to herself and to her Maker; and however varied or profound her acquirements may at any period of her life have been; however widely science and art and literature may have opened their treasures to her eager and ever-active mind, all were still vain to her when compared with affection and goodness; still, as ever before, the simplest and cheapest enjoyments were the truest and most precious; still were generosity of sentiment and indulgence towards others, combined with the humblest estimate of her own powers, her crowning mental superiority. "Sometimes," she thus writes, "a sweet dream haunts me of happy life spent in Gloucester; of a *home* there filled with peace and industry and love; of my husband ministering to a people who have endeared themselves to us by a thousand kindnesses; of my daughter growing in

Digitized by Google

goodness and filling our house with joy." And again, "I pass my time very pleasantly, because very busily, here, divided between literary and maternal cares. I study two languages—German and 'baby-talk'—the latter the more interesting of the two." Not a trace of the early loving and simple nature has disappeared. No pedantic affectation has choked the bright waters of pure and womanly affection; and all the long-loved, long-studied lore of foreign tongues falls less sweetly upon the mother's ear than the simple, delicious cooings of untaught infancy.

But why do we thus impose on our readers our own remarks upon the beautiful character of our friend and poet-sister, when others before us have in far better language already drawn its lovely features? Yet let us be pardoned if we have in some measure forgotten her writings, in our admiration of her life, and our desire to avail ourselves of so favorable an opportunity to render a just and heartfelt tribute to one we loved and reverenced in this life, and still more deeply love and reverence in her new and holier and happier mode of existence,—an existence she seemed almost to have entered upon ere death dropped that veil between her and us, which shuts from our eyes all the glories by which she is now surrounded. But on one point more of her rare and saint-like character we would fain be indulged a moment longer.

The last two or three years of her short life, while they were distinguished by much happiness, were marked also by great domestic calamities. Thrice during that period had death entered her family and stricken down those that were to her objects of unmeasured affection: a beloved father, a sister of her youth, and last of all a brother who seems to have been to her as the core of her heart, and well-deserved to be. He was a young man of rare moral excellence, and his friends had early discovered in him the germ of future intellectual greatness. It was designed to confer on him the advantages of a liberal education. But a reverse of fortune ensued; pecuniary embarrassments gathered around, and forbade so considerable an expenditure as would be required in the execution of that design. But the object was too near the heart of Mrs. Mayo to be easily relinquished, and she determined that, with the blessing of God, her own industry and talents should

Digitized by Google

furnish the means for its accomplishment. Her affectionate determination was realized. Year after year she diligently and cheerfully toiled, with heart and head and hand, until the object of so much devotion finally left the University, all that her sisterly love could desire—a model of manly virtue and of intellectual promise. But by no language of our own can we convey so just and striking a conception of this young man as is conveyed in the beautiful and concise sketch by Mr. Mayo. "He was in all respects a noble man. To intellectual powers of the highest order, he united the deepest feeling, and the grace of a fine person and engaging manners. No one could have seen him without believing that he was made to do a great work. He possessed that calm and indomitable energy of purpose, which is the surest indication of greatness; his judgement was ripe beyond his years, far-seeing and decisive; and we all leaned upon him instinctively, as if weakness could not touch a being so self-sustained, or the troubles of others disturb a love so disinterested. In religious culture he was truly a Christian: spiritual and strong, devout and practical."

It was for this brother, thus endowed with the noblest gifts, that Mrs. Mayo labored, and for whom, with such ardent hope, she looked forward to a future of usefulness and honor. On leaving the University, he went to Gloucester for the purpose of spending the summer and recruiting his somewhat delicate health. Here the communion between the brother and sister seems to have been delightful and elevating, and a summer was passed and a life lived, such as in this hurrying, every-day world is seldom enjoyed. So calm, so happy, so undisturbed, so rich in all that can elevate our spiritual, or purify and dignify our social nature, it must have been a foretaste of that Heaven to which they were both fast tending.

But the blow fell. At a period when the sister was herself prostrate upon a bed of weakness and suffering, a sudden illness assailed the brother, and he died. It is in her letters, written immediately after this sad event, and while she was still a prisoner in her sick-room, that all the true greatness and sublimity of soul are first brought clearly to the light. And here these qualities are, beyond almost any thing we have ever known, beautiful and

Digitized by Google

triumphant. She saw her fondest hopes fade away, but not a murmur of regret escaped her. She witnessed the sudden frustration of favorite projects, long and carefully matured, and she exclaimed, "I mourn not that all this is past—never will, never can, I mourn it." Once, twice, thrice, in quick succession, she had seen the objects of her dearest affections lie down together in the hallowed peace of the grave; but the sunshine fled not from her heart, and she needed no comforting. Amid her manifold trials and bereavements, all things to her seemed simple, solemn, and reconciling. No discord jarred upon her spirit; all, there, was harmony, sweet peace, and resignation. But we never can convey to our readers a true sense of this spiritual elevation, but by presenting them with portions of these letters, which to us are the most attractive of all her prose writings, where Christian greatness so blends with womanly softness and affection, and sublimity and solemnity of sentiment are in so wonderful keeping with all that is elegant and simple in language. If they have read them before, this opportunity to read them again will not be unprized.

"On this beautiful Sabbath morning," she thus writes to a valued friend, "holy and serene, when all nature is composed, and all heaven is at peace, shall I not make the hours of my solitude and weakness a season of grateful trust in God, and of consolation and good cheer to myself and you? Would that you were here, dear Sir, the peace and courage that is in my own soul could not fail to impart itself to you. You would feel as I do that our loss is not terrible, but that our gain is great. Yes; even in his dying hour itself, I felt that the immortal was to be to me the nearer companion, the trustier guide, the more perpetual joy and strength than ever the mortal had been or could be; that I was losing nothing but gaining all, by that great transition of his soul from weakness and bondage to the freedom and power of the spiritual and immortal life. Never have I felt him gone, never can I. Can we, who have talked together so much, and always in such perfect sympathy of faith, respecting the nature of the future life, can *we* ever be separated by any failure of the bodily senses to recognize each other? Could John have known that he was to die, would he have ever told me that he was to be *parted* from me? Oh, no! His soul was as strong in the assurance of its perpetual consciousness and growth, as in that of its earthly existence, and he who never felt separated from the

Digitized by Google

friends who had gone before him, will never abandon those he has left behind. It is this which makes me calm, yes, happy, strong, and full of solemn courage for the future struggles of life. It seems no mystery to me that he died. He had lived but a few years, but they were years of such rapid growth to his soul, that this life seemed to have nothing more left for him. He needed no more of its trials to instruct him. He was fully taught for a higher work than any that this life could furnish him . . . . Probably, of his deeper spiritual nature, no person knew so much as myself. Nor did I ever know it till during the last summer, while we were alone here together in our studies, and forming together our plans for future usefulness. But I mourn not that all this is past—never will, never can, I mourn it. God knows the true place for great souls to labor, and happy is that noble brother of ours, that he has been found worthy to be employed in a celestial sphere."

And to another friend she thus writes:

. . . . "And yet I can feel the full reality of his spiritual presence. I am not one hour without the strength derived from it. Not one prayer for help from him is unanswered. I see his calm smile as distinctly as ever. And the weakness I once strove to conceal from his high strength, I now confide to him, in the trust that it will be overcome by such communion. People come in to me looking so sad, I cannot think for some moments why it is. I forget entirely that I have any grief till they remind me of it. And it is not grief; it deserves some gentler name. . . . . I mourn him because others mourn, rather than becouse that to me he is lost." "Though my brother is dead, [false word!]; though my husband is absent; though my friends at home are sick and suffering, still I find myself as cheerful, as calm, as contented as ever. . . . . Every thing looks clear and harmonious; I see no mysteries and hear no discords."

But we forbear to introduce farther quotations from these letters, beautiful as they are, and hasten to say a few words of the style and execution of the Memoir, ere we pass to a notice of, and make a few extracts from, the poems; for it is by these, rather than her prose, that the subject of this article will live a "bright particular star," in our denomination. Yet we venture to assert that never will the *woman* be forgotten in her writings.

The biographer of Mrs. Mayo has, we think, executed his melancholy but delightful task with great judgement

Digitized by Google

and good taste, and a spirit of untold and reverential affection. The style is simple and unostentatious, as was the fine spirit it was used to portray. No one could have performed the work better—who could have done it as well? We owe him much for this, the most complete memoir of any writer who has lived and died among us. And he will receive his reward in the admiration and gratitude of the many who loved and admired her, that though unseen she is still with us.

We now pass to the poetry of Mrs. Mayo. In this most beautiful, most artistic department of literature, few of her age have written so much or so generally well, although her efforts are by no means equal. Yet we can say of her,—what cannot be said of all poets—seldom has she written any thing in verse which is not *poetry*. So richly endowed was she with true poetic fire, so enthusiastic was her love of nature, so delicate her appreciation of its beauties, she had but to yield her soul to these influences, and poetry gushed forth like a full river,—a river along whose varied course it is most delightful to loiter.

There is an impassioned earnestness in the style of her earlier productions, which is not so apparent in many of her later ones, when the hand of the scholar and the artist become more visible; yet we read no poetry which impresses us with a deeper conviction that it comes from the innermost heart of the author, and is "unfeigned and unexaggerated." Indeed, she is, we think, peculiar in this, that, through many years of her earlier literary labors, you can almost trace her inner life through all its delicate variations from shade to shade. You meet in them no delineations of vice, or evil and stormy passions, no expressions of a morbid and diseased fancy, but all is peaceful, fervent, loving and devotional. We are struck, in turning over the pages, at the great predominance of the devotional spirit throughout,—but devotion, gentle, mild, loving, elevating, without a tincture of gloom or of self-righteousness, or the grovelling sentiment of fear.

"Tokens;" "To my Sisters;" "The Crown of Life;" "The Good Shepherd;" "The Pure in Heart see God;" "The Temptation in the Wilderness;" are the first in the selection, following one another in the order in which we have placed them, and are all devotional pieces, and all

Digitized by Google

excellent in their kind. Then comes "Bow-Brook," a gem which is delightful from beginning to end. So felicitous is it in expression you seem to hear and see the "prattling thing," as it goes dancing on through sunny slopes and flowery meadows, now winding with a quieter flow through shady dells "where dark green woods o'erlook the tide,"—its sweet music ever and anon mingling with the thrilling gush of song from the "gay birds, with blue and golden breasts," that found their colonies amid its overhanging branches. You walk side by side with the author as she searches for

> "Some lingering trace
> Of those who made, in days of yore,
> Thy banks their favorite hunting-place."

But alas, no trace remains—"the Indian maid" who wreathed her dark locks with the gay cardinal flowers which star its borders, and the warrior who there sharpened his arrow for the chase, are alike vanished; and

> "No trace is found
> To tell that ever dusky maid,
> Or warrior chief hath trod the ground,
> Where now, perchance, their bones are laid."

But brighter years have come. On its banks the poet's home has succeeded "the Indian brave's," and from its wave her infant eye first caught its reflected beam. Brighter and holier hopes and aspirations have been nurtured by its shore than ever the dusky savage cherished. The song now takes a sweeter and sadder cadence, and we cannot forbear quoting the remainder entire:

> "When comes the holy hour to die,
> How sweet to rest beside thy wave!
> How sweet beneath thy banks to lie,
> With violets waving o'er my grave!
> And yet I would not cast a shade
> Upon a spot so bright and glad;
> A tomb would mar so fair a glade,
> And friends would find thy borders sad.
>
> Glide on, forever, warbling brook!
> Earth has no voice more dear than thine—
> And often, in some flowery nook,
> I'll swell the lay with tones of mine.
> Beneath the arch of some green bough,
> Where mellow sunbeams softly glance,
> I'll cast the shadows from my brow,
> And read to thee some gay romance.

Digitized by Google

A few short years, or days may be,
And thou wilt miss me from thy shore;
Yet earth will still be fair to thee,
As e'er it was in days of yore.
And I shall sit upon the bank
Of that pure river of my God,
Where sin, nor grief has ever drank,
And no polluting foot hath trod!"

The next article, "Types of Heaven," is characteristic. In every thing around her, the poet finds types of heaven, and therefore she loves all things. The sweet wild-flowers, the "wood-notes wild," the evening dew, the stars, the woodland spring, every bed of moss, rainbows, streamlets, all speak of heaven, and from each and all,

"Links are lengthened unto God."

Beauty is of heavenly birth and will therefore live forever, and the burden of the song is—and the grand conclusion,

"*Foul* things perish, but the *pure*,
Long as angels shall endure."

The two succeeding pieces, "The Last Supper," and a "Song," we cannot particularly notice. The last is a pretty, sparkling thing, but the former heavier than Mrs. Mayo was wont to write. "A Sketch from Life," we should be glad to copy entire, but dare not take the room. It is the life-history of a girl. Her early home, and all the sweet and pure associations of her childhood and girlhood are charmingly delineated. The love of nature's sweet and lonely haunts, the companionship of squirrels, and birds that "half called her by her gentle name," and of the flowers whose exquisite odors charmed her senses—all paint the gentle poet herself. Then the change—the new strange dreams, deeper and sweeter than the dreams of childhood that by and by stole into her heart, yet bound it not more strongly to earth, but drew it nearer and nearer still to heaven. The mysterious life that, unrecognized before, now seemed to fill and animate all things, till all sounds took a deeper tone,

"For her heart grew deep,
And fountains waked that ne'er again might sleep."

Then comes the question—how prophetic!

Digitized by Google

"Believe you, spirits toned like hers have long
A dwelling on the tuneless shores of time?
Not long. The light-winged bird soon hushed her song,
And floated up to a serener clime.
She knew love's home could never be below—
Why should she linger to endure its woe?

Home, like an uncaged bird she gladly sped,
Home, with the sunbeams on her buoyant wing;
Home, where the beautiful have early fled,
And where they make no discord when they sing;
Home hath she gone.—"

The next article is also deeply characteristic, "The Spirit's Change." God works in a young and glad but careless spirit, and fills it with higher and diviner thoughts. He teaches it to behold Himself as he is, and to recognize beauty rather than terror in the robes of death. He descends into the "silent slumbers of her heart," and makes her "feel her immortality." Then all is changed, and she waits patiently, but expectantly, till God shall call her home.

But we must not stop to give even the titles of those which next succeed. There is a charming story of a "Mountain Girl," and a poem, "The Woodpath," full of all sweet fancies and instructive teachings, and one, "My Father," beautiful in its simple and reverential affection.

We now reluctantly shut our eyes against the thousand beauties which thickly begem the intervening pages, and come to "The Supremacy of God," a noble and majestic poem,—certainly one of Mrs. Mayo's best. Here again want of space forbids even a synopsis; we give only one of its fine stanzas as a specimen of the whole:

"God shone upon the nations. In the west
The owl-like Druid saw the brightening rays,
And muffling his gray robes across his breast,
Strode like a phantom from the coming blaze.
Old Odin, throned amid the polar haze,
Heard the shrill cry of Vala on the blast,
And glancing southward with a wild amaze,
Saw God's bright banner o'er the nations cast,
Then to his dim old halls retreated far and fast!"

But we grow alarmed at our accumulating manuscript, and hasten on, merely touching at a few pieces which it is impossible to pass,—"The Retrospect," charming as the sweetest of Burns', of whom it reminds us; "Memory's

Digitized by Google

Picture-Gallery," one picture of which we cannot forbear hanging up to the gaze of admiration:

"What scene is this? A fairy isle,
Upon a bright, blue, mountain river;
The sunlit waves around it smile,
The aspens o'er it droop and shiver.

A little bark is moored thereby;
O, fair and soft the hands that row it!
And dark as midnight is the eye
Of sweet Sheshequin's gentle poet!

Her barque 'neath flowery shadows floats,
Its sail a broad and starry banner!
While softly to the rower's notes
Chimes in the low-voiced Susquehanna!"

How delicate and warm-hearted the spirit of the above touches, to us who knew and loved their subject!

We now come to a series of poems which we shall distinguish by the title of scholastic:—"The Ferry," "Leila Grey," "Udollo," "The Lord de Beaumonaire," "Eda," and "Nora." In all of these the influence of the author's German studies are clearly visible, and most beautifully and perfectly are the German spirit and English verse wedded together. In all our readings we think we have met with nothing more perfect of its kind than "Udollo." The melody flows on in the beautiful and stately chime of some of the finest of the old English ballads, and falls upon the ear in most delicious cadence. It is perhaps the most finished and artistic of all that Mrs. Mayo has ever written. Its great length alone prevents our giving it entire. It commences thus:

"So sweet the fount of Thura sings,
'Tis said below a Maid there is,
Who strikes a lyre of silver strings
To spirit symphonies.

A Youth once sought that fountain's side,
Udollo of the golden hair;
He cast a garland in the tide,
And thus invoked the Maiden there:

'Oh, Maid of Thura, from thy halls
Of gleaming crystal, deign to rise!
The golden-haired Udollo calls,
And yearns to gaze within thine eyes.
Fain would he touch that magic lyre

Digitized by Google

Whose echoes he has heard above,
And kindle every dulcet wire
With an adoring, burning love.
Come, Maid of Thura, from thy halls;
The golden-haired Udollo calls!'"

The maiden hears his call and appears,—a being with "eyes of river-blue" and "amber-tresses dropt with gold," and "foam-white bosom," whose beauty but touches the breast of Udolla with a deeper fire. Her silver lyre is trembling in her hand, and the impassioned youth implores her to bestow it on him ere to her touch it ceases to quiver. She warns him of the danger he incurs, but gives him the lyre, warning him of *one* wire he must never strike. Udollo seizes the lyre and mounting his coal black steed flits away, wildly sweeping the strings, but heeding the warning of "Thura's maid," and waking not the forbidden wire. But ever and anon a low, sweet symphony rises from this charmed wire, breathing joy and hope and love and pure desire; and when Udollo's music died away, that "wondrous chord" would swell far and wide its ravishing lay. At last it grew still, and never more echoed to Udollo's strains. But the memory of it lived in his soul, and

"A love—a woe—he knew not what,
Flamed up within his brain!"

But sometimes when all was calm and still, that wire would waken of itself "strains of soft entrancing love,"

"And for this rare and fitful strain
He waited with intense desire;
There centred, in delirious pain,
His spirit's all devouring fire."

* * * * * *

"One night when long the lyre had slept,
Udollo's passion, like a sea
Of red-hot lava, madly swept
His soul on to its destiny."

And he struck the fatal wire!

"A fire shot through Udollo's frame,
As shoots the lightning's forked dart;
It lit a hot and smothered flame
Within his deepest heart.
He felt it in its slow, sure path
Consume his quivering nerves away;

Digitized by Google

Oh could he but have checked its wrath,
  Or ceased that fearful strain to play!
His fingers, cleaving to the wire,
  Had lost communion with his will;
Within him burnt th' Immortal Fire,
  The Heart—the Life-Destroyer still!

Days, weeks, and months whirled on, and on;
  No hope by day, nor rest by night;
Only the same wild, frantic tone
  Increasing in its woful might."

Under this dreadful enchantment Udollo gradually shrunk and faded away to a mere shadowy outline.

"At last, in utter wreck and woe,
  Back to the fountain's brink he crept,—
His golden hair—now white as snow—
  Far down his bosom swept."

But the fountain was gloomy and dark, and the Maid of Thura answered not to his imploring call to take back her lyre. At length he sank upon the fountain's brink, and the lyre sunk bubbling into the wave. Then

"The fire went out within his breast—
  The tremor of his nerves was still;
As peacefully he sank to rest,
  As a tired infant will."

A radiant bow of peace arose from the fountain and hung over his heart, and a sweet, delicious strain stole up, whose burden was,

"How sweet such dreamless, deep repose,
To those who sin and suffer long!"

We have dwelt long on this poem, for it has merit enough to make the fame of a poet who had written nothing else. Much as we regret it, we must pass the rest without further remark, giving only one more whose beauty speaks for itself.

LEILA GREY.

A BALLAD.

The tassels wave upon the birch,
  The maple blushes o'er the stream,
And through the oriel of the church,
  I see the May-moon's yellow beam.
Oh here, upon this moss-grown wall,
  Another year, another May,
I saw this same sweet moonlight fall
  On me and Leila Grey!

Digitized by Google

Cold lay her languid hand in mine,
  Pale, pale her face beside me shone;
"Sweet Leila Grey, as I am thine,
  Say, say that thou art all mine own!"
She smiled—she sighed,—"Behold," she said,
  "Where, from the church tower darkly thrown,
The shadow of the cross lies spread
  By yon sepulchral stone.

"There, ere the May-moon comes again,
  The hand that presses thine will lie;
Before the reaper cuts the grain,
  The death-mist will o'ercloud my eye.
But oh, dear Willie, do not weep,
  For I am weary, weary here!
And fain beneath yon cross would sleep,
  Before another year!

"But when another May returns,
  And through the oriel of the church,
The golden moonlight dimly burns,
  And lights the tassels of the birch;
When yonder maple by the tower,
  Stands blushing like a virgin bride,
Oh come, dear Willie, at this hour,
  And seat thee by my side!"

Sweet Leila! I obey thy call;
  The May-moon lights the tasselled birch,
And I upon the moss-grown wall,
  Am sitting near the gray old church;
The shadow of the cross is thrown,
  Where gleams a marble tablet now—
'Twas all the same twelve months agone—
  But Leila where art thou?

Mrs. Mayo made many translations from both the German and French, and in this department she was singularly felicitous. The best of these are we think from Uhland, whose tone and spirit she has most faithfully preserved, and whose genius seems more in unison with her own than that of any other foreign poet. We cannot but wish she had carried out her design of translating his entire volume.

The prose selections in the volume are "Annette Lee," "The Martyr," "Eleonora," "The Rustic Wife," "Gossipings of Idle Hours," "Debby Lincoln," "The Deformed Boy," "Lydia Vernon," and "Esther," the last of which is the most finished tale. They are all written in a sweet

Digitized by Google

and pleasant and often brilliant style, and many very, very beautiful things are said in them. But they lack the noble elevation which is so peculiar to Mrs. Mayo's poetry. Still they are sweet stories, and will long be read by the admirers of Mrs. Mayo.

We now reluctantly take our leave of this volume, having been most happy in our task of reviewing it after our poor manner. We have found it difficult to leave the poetry, and were never so impressed with its beauties, and a sense of the thousand things we ought to say, as at the moment when we withdrew our hand from the "charmed chords." Never did we feel more deeply than at this moment how bright a star vanished from our sky when our poet-sister departed. We believe with her biographer that she had not yet fully uttered herself, and that it "pleased her Father that, for some future state of being, should be reserved the complete expression of that nature, which was a poem and a prayer!" C. M. S.

Article XXXI.

Literary Notices.

1. Narrative of the United States' Expedition to the River Jordan and the Dead Sea, by W. F. Lynch, U. S. N. Commander of the Expedition. With Maps and numerous Illustrations. Philadelphia: Lea and Blanchard. 1849. 8vo. pp. 508.

The official Report of this Expedition, which has not yet been published by Congress, is needed as the complement of this volume. The present work is but the personal narrative of the Commander, gathered from his own observations and those of other members, and containing a general account of the proceedings of the party, as well as of their discoveries in the valley of the Jordan and the Dead Sea. The scientific facts and results, which belong more especially to the official Report, are omitted.

Commander Lynch, with his associates, sixteen in all, landed on the shore of Palestine, in the bay of St. Jean d' Acre, March 29th, 1848. After making excursions to Mt. Carmel, &c. they

Digitized by Google

proceeded by the way of Sefûrieh (Sepphora,) and Nazareth, to Tiberias on the lake of that name. On the 10th of April, they left the lake, and began the descent of the lower Jordan, one party in boats, and another on the banks; and at the end of about nine days' hazardous navigation, in which they thoroughly explored the very crooked and very broken channel of the river, they entered the Dead Sea on the 18th of April. Cruising across this in almost every direction, lengthwise and sidewise, with the lead constantly in use; ascertaining its depth in every part, and the composition of its bottom; examining its shores, the mouths of the Wadys, or torrents and streams, that enter it, its promontories and recesses; and exploring the ancient ruins on its mountain coasts, they passed twenty-two days on its waters and on its margin, in an atmosphere often stifling, the mercury ranging from 75° sometimes to 106° in the shade. It was the first time the Dead Sea had ever been explored by one who lived to tell the story. The preservation of the party from the fatal fever that lurks around this deeply sunken coast, may have been owing in some measure to the wise regulation of the Commander: every member of the Expedition having been required to sign the pledge of total Abstinence before leaving America. During these twenty-two days, they visited the ancient ruins at Sebbeh (Masada,) and 'Ain Jidy (Engedi,) the salt mountain of Usdum, near the site probably of Sodom, where they climbed a pillar of salt, passed over the site of the ancient Zoar on the eastern peninsula, and made an excursion to Kerak (Kir Moab,) among the neighboring mountains of Moab. Having "carefully sounded the sea, determined its geographical position, taken the exact topography of its shores, ascertained the temperature, width, depth, and velocity of its tributaries, collected specimens of every kind, and noted the winds, currents, changes of weather, and all atmospheric phenomena," they took their final departure from the margin, at 'Ain Terâbeh, three or four miles south of the mouth of the torrent Kedron. Their impressions with respect to the Mosaic account of the destruction of "the cities of the plain," are stated thus: "It is for the learned to comment on the facts we have laboriously collected. Upon ourselves, the result is a decided one. We entered on this sea with conflicting opinions. One of the party was skeptical, and another, I think, a professed unbeliever of the Mosaic account. After twenty-two days' close investigation, if I am not mistaken, we are unanimous in the conviction of the truth of the scriptural account of the destruction of the cities of the plain. I record with diffidence the conclusions we have reached, simply as a protest against the shallow deductions of *would be* unbelievers." (p. 380.)

Digitized by Google

From 'Ain Tebâreh they went across the mountain-desert, and by the Convent of St. Sabas, to Jerusalem; and thence, after making some excursions, to Jaffa, carrying a level from the Dead Sea to the Mediterranean. From Jaffa, one party proceeded by sea, and one by land, to St. Jean d'Acre. Starting again from this point, they went, by Nazareth, the plain of Esdraelon, and Mount Tabor, to Tiberias; traversed the western shore of the sea of Galilee, and then ascended the valley of the upper Jordan, by lake Merom, to the source of the river at the western foot of Jebel esh Sheikh, the snow-clad Mount Hermon of the Scriptures. Their route extended in this direction to Damascus. Here they turned and crossed the Lebanon chains, by Balbec to Beirût, where they arrived on the 30th of June. In a few days afterwards, Lieut. Dale, one of the most efficient members of the Expedition, sank under the fatigues and exposures of the severe task, while the rest of the party soon recovered from the sickness with which the most of them were visited.

The invaluable Researches of Prof. Robinson and Rev. Mr. Smith, together with this Narrative of Lieut. Lynch, which may be regarded as an Appendix to them, have made us familiarly acquainted with every part of Palestine. It is a ground of reasonable pride that by far the most thorough exploration of that country is the work of Americans. We may be allowed to indulge a feeling of complacency, without incurring the charge of national vanity, that the only tract within the limits of the Holy Land, which remained almost impervious to the Biblical student, is now laid open by an enterprize under the authority of the United States. The mysterious spell that rested on the Dead Sea is broken, and its secrets yielded up. We shall wait with impatience the publication of the official Report, for the additional facts that have been collected.

At the same time, there are two things which we cannot but regret. It is evident that the Commander was not so thoroughly acquainted, as was desirable, with the literary history of the geography of Palestine. Had he studied it beforehand with any thing like the care and completeness with which Prof. Robinson had qualified himself, his laborious exploration, which is deserving of the highest praise, would have been more productive of results. And then, his style of writing offends good taste, as often as he aspires to be eloquent. For certain inaccuracies, and for negligences, he may indeed offer the excuse that he was obliged to hasten his publication in order to secure the field against a much more inadequate Narrative which appeared from one of his associates. But this does not account for the turgid,

Digitized by Google

school-boy faults that we refer to. Whenever he has a press of matter on his hands, so as to keep him close to his work, he expresses himself with sufficient propriety and to the point; but when he finds leisure to adorn his page with the effusions of sentiment, he betrays himself. This is unfortunate for the reputation of his work, though it detracts nothing from the information it affords. The same false taste has led him sometimes into rather fulsome adulation of our country and countrymen, which certainly do not appear well in a national work. It may do for the Mussulmans to say "God is great, and Mahomet is his Prophet!" but it is not becoming in us to shout, "God is great, and the United States is his masterpiece!"

2. A Voice to Universalists. By Hosea Ballou. &c. Boston: Published by J. M. Usher, 1849. 12mo. pp. 327.

This title was probably suggested by the peculiar character of three leading articles in the work, namely, A General Epistle to Universalists, Essay on Universalism, and Advice to Young Men who design to enter the Ministry. These pieces are distinguished by that tone of familiar address and fatherly solicitude, which the author's great age, services, and standing in our connection, render so proper and becoming in him. Nothing can be kinder than the manner in which he offers his suggestions, admonitions, warnings, and advice, to his brethren, both lay and clerical; and we feel confident that the multitudes of believers, who have long venerated him, will desire to profit by these dictates of experience and love. The topics on which he insists, in his Epistle to Universalists, are of the simplest kind; but they are fundamental to our individual welfare, and to our social prosperity and usefulness. He urges on us the faithful use of the Scriptures, and devout adherence to them; observance of the Christian Sabbath, and attendance on public worship; regular religious meetings of the lay brethren wherever there are not enough of them to support preaching; formation of churches, and communion in the Lord's Supper; religious education of children in families; and support of Sunday Schools. To those who intend to preach, he earnestly recommends the attainment of a suitable education, as a preparatory step; love of the gospel, and of the work of the ministry, as the determining motive in choosing that profession; thorough study of the Bible, with judicious use of helps to understand it; the Christian spirit and prudence in carrying forward the reforms of the day; careful economy in pecuniary concerns; and an humble disposition. He dissuades them from entering the ministry with an aim at worldly honors, popular applause, or fashionable distinction, and warns them of the disappointment

Digitized by Google

they will be likely to meet with in our connection, if these be their object; he kindly admonishes them not to temporize in their preaching in order to gain the patronage even of other denominations of Christians, but to be true to their calling; he points out the evils of suffering themselves to become involved in debts, to the injury of others and of their own supporters. May the several points of advice and admonition be heeded by all who profess "the grace of God that bringeth salvation to all men."

There are pieces also of an argumentative and dogmatic kind, some of which had been published before, and some of which now appear for the first time, and are marked by the author's usual acumen. More than half of the volume consists of Metrical Compositions, collected from different works and periodicals, to which he had contributed them. We observe an oversight on page 281; the lines there inserted were composed by his eldest brother, Benjamin Ballou.

Our thanks are due to the Publisher for the very handsome style in which this volume is printed, and for the only good likeness of Mr. Ballou which has ever been struck off.

3. The Bucolics, Georgics, and Aeneid of Virgil: with English Notes, a Life of Virgil, and Remarks upon Scanning, by Edward Moore, M. A. Boston: Benjamin B. Mussey and Company. 1849. 12mo. pp. 551.

This is the neatest and handsomest edition that we have seen of Virgil for the use of schools. It may be described in two parts. The first is occupied by the Latin text, in a type clear, open, and of good size. The second contains a short Life of Virgil, a few pages of Remarks on Scanning, with exemplifications; and then follow the Notes, which fill nearly half of the volume. Of these we may say, in the language of the editor, that they are such as "neither, on the one hand, to save the student the trouble of referring to his lexicon and grammar, nor, on the other, to leave him to contend unassisted with the intricacies of a difficult passage." They appear to be just what is needed for their purpose.

4. The Stars and the Earth; or, Thoughts on Space, Time, and Eternity. From the Third English Edition. Boston: Wm. Crosby and H. P. Nichols, 111 Washington Street. 1849. 18mo. pp. 88.

This is an attempt to illustrate, and to bring down to popular apprehension, the philosophical paradox, that there is no time nor space; that our ideas of these are merely forms of conception, which arise from the peculiar organization of our senses and of our minds, but without any thing answering to them in real

Digitized by Google

existence. The illustration is very ingeniously conducted, and is made perfectly intelligible to every attentive reader, at the same time that it calls upon him for a very pleasant exercise of his imagination. We have tried to abridge it into the compass of a paragraph; but we have failed, by reason of the numerous suppositions on which it is framed. We can only indicate its character, by saying that it is founded principally on the property of light to convey images of objects to a beholder at a distance, so as to make those objects seem present to him after they have passed away. On the sun, the appearance of the earth is such as it was eight minutes before it is seen; on the farthest telescopic stars, such as it was several thousand years before. The light that left our earth at the creation of man, bearing with it the images of transactions then passing here, has but just reached some of the more distant stars, where it reveals those transactions (if any eye, there, be strong enough to perceive them,) as now taking place. This illustration, when carried out into all its conceivable details, enables us to see how time may be disposed of. And then with respect to space,—suppose that all objects were contracted to half, or a quarter, or a thousandth part, of their present apparent size, they still keeping exactly the same relation to each other in bulk and distance, would not the whole seem to us just as it does now? Every thing being *comparatively* the same, would not every thing be, to us, *apparently* the same? A Magic Lantern will reduce a large picture, or a Camera Obscura contract a wide landscape, into a very small compass, yet retaining all the several parts; and we can conceive of a method to bring the reflection, in these cases, to a point, which should still retain all those parts, since they could be made to diverge again by a lens fitted to this purpose. Thus we dispose of space. We give but the leading illustrations; and even these we have stripped of all the beauty and interest with which the author clothes them. We commend the tract itself to those who are fond of such speculations, and to all who would enjoy an hour of pleasant reading. With the latter, its brevity will be a recommendation.

Perhaps the author would not be disposed to regard it as a fatal objection, that his illustrations have no scientific value, since he did not design to make them scientific. We think, however, that they ought to have been of this character, in order to be of any value whatsoever,—we mean, towards explaining a strictly philosophical proposition. They assume the existence of time and space, in their very premises, and in all their processes. Scientifically considered, they illustrate nothing but the various points of view from which we may be supposed to regard time

Digitized by Google

and space. They set out with the absurdity of proposing to demonstrate, *empirically*, that which nobody ever pretended is empirically true; for the hypothesis is, that time and space are exclusively empirical notions. This absurdity entirely vitiates the work in respect to its aim, though it does not much detract from the amusement and the suggestions it affords.

As to the philosophical paradox itself, that there is in reality no time nor space,—we were, in our younger days, inclined to admit it, as a ground for understanding the relations of the Infinite with the finite; of explaining how the multiplied parts of the Universe proceeded from One First Cause; how God knows all things, past, present, and future, as we regard them; how he is omnipresent, &c. But we were surprised to find, in the end, that the paradox, even when admitted, explained nothing except by annihilating every thing that we conceive of as existing in time and space. One would think that this consideration might have occurred to a rational inquirer, at the first. To us it appears that the paradox legitimately resolves itself, through Pantheism, into Nihilism. At the very first move, it sweeps away the finite, making it to be phenomenal, merely seeming, but not real. It allows no succession, of course no activity, no cause and effect; it allows no multiplicity or variety, no parts nor relations; and finally it admits only a point without magnitude,—and this is nothing. It is easy to void difficulties in explaining the Universe, by ignoring the Universe.

Should we be asked, now, how we understand, and explain philosophically, the relation of the Infinite with the finite,—we will venture to propose an hypothesis of our own; though we are well aware that it will shut us out from all respect of the omniscient class of philosophers. It is this: that we are but finite creatures. No one, who deliberately considers this, needs to be shown that, with finite powers, we cannot guage the Infinite, nor analyze scientifically the passage from the finite to the Infinite. The attempt itself is an absurdity; and all the analyses, that are wrought out in a purely scientific way, are absurdities. The history of omniscient philosophies, whether as developed in ancient times, or as reproduced in modern ages, and in our own day, is the most striking comment which the world has ever afforded on that saying of the apostle, "Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools."

5. Remarks on the Petition for an Act Incorporating the College of the Holy Cross. [From Brownson's Quarterly Review.] Boston: Benjamin H. Greene, 124 Washington Street. 1849. 8vo. pp. 27.

The petition, here referred to, was laid before the legislature of Massachusetts, last winter; and, after the usual course of

Digitized by Google

examination, leave was given to withdraw it. As the college, for which the act of incorporation was asked, had been established by Catholics, (at Worcester,) it has been thought, by some, that the petition was dismissed for that reason. This is the view that Mr. Brownson seems to take of the transaction. But if we understand the case, the facts were these: 1. It was proposed, by the Committee of the legislature, to grant the petitioners such a charter as had been given to Amherst college; and such a charter the petitioners refused to accept, as they unquestionably had a right to do, because it would not answer their purposes. 2. The college, for which they asked a charter, was one exclusively sectarian in its specific regulations, as no other college in this Commonwealth is, and open to none except those who would conform to the faith, discipline, and worship, of a particular church. 3. It was on account of this exclusive ground only that the Committee reported against the petition; and not because the institution was formed or patronized by Catholics, for the very same privileges in respect to their religious peculiarities, were actually offered to them, that are granted to other colleges.

Now, if these are the facts, it appears to us that the Committee acted impartially, in dismissing the petition. We see not how they could have acted otherwise, consistently with precedent. It would have revolutionized the established policy of the Commonwealth, to grant a charter in these premises. Let us ask, Would our legislature incorporate a college of which the Bye-Laws obliged every officer and every student to be an Episcopalian? or to be an Orthodox Congregationalist? or a Unitarian? or Baptist? or Universalist? &c. If not, it has treated the Catholics, in this case, just as it would treat every other sect in similar circumstances; and nothing can be clearer than that they do wrong to complain that any inequality has been shown them. On the other hand, had their petition been granted, then every other sect, that should ask for a like exclusive college-charter, would be fairly entitled to it, and would get such exclusiveness not merely sanctioned, but perpetuated, by law, and thus fixed beyond the reach of the ordinary changes of public sentiment. Nor would this revolution in our legislative policy stop here. The new principle would, in its natural developement, extend eventually to our common public schools, and we should at length have them all parcelled out among our different sects; one exclusively for Catholic children, another for Protestant Orthodox, another for Unitarian, another for Universalists, &c. Such, indeed, is the state of things that some have already desired to see established. Introduce the principle, and we should soon find its legitimate results demanded by too many to be resisted.

Digitized by Google

6. The Mechanic's Assistant: A thorough practical Treatise on Mensuration, and the Sliding Rule: teaching the manner of Drawing all regular superfices, and the most concise method of Finding the areas of all regular superfices, and the contents of all regular solids, both by Numbers and by the Sliding Rule. Treating also of the Laws of Motion—the Descent of Falling Bodies—the Strength of Materials—the Mechanical Powers—the Elasticity and Force of Steam—Specific Gravities—Levelling—the Pendulum, etc. Adapted for the use of Carpenters, Shipwrights, Wheelwrights, Sawyers, Guagers, Lumbermen, Students, and Artisans generally. By D. M. Knapen, A. M. New York: D. Appleton & Company, 200 Broadway. &c. 1849. 12mo. pp. 276.

We have quoted the whole of this title-page, because it so fully explains the contents and the purpose of the treatise. We cannot judge practically of such works; but a cursory examination of the volume has led us to think it remarkably well adapted to its object. We shall be disappointed if mechanics do not find it a treasury of rules, suggestions, tables, and scientific facts, which are of important use in their several pursuits. It is very neat in its construction, (we do not speak of the print and binding, but of the arrangement and execution of the treatise;) every thing is in its place, and every thing is intelligible.

7. A Week on the Concord and Merrimack Rivers. By Henry D. Thoreau. Boston and Cambridge: James Munroe and Company. 1849. 12mo. pp. 413.

Few books need expurgation more than this one, and few deserve it better. All sorts of subjects, foreign to the general drift of purpose implied in the title and running through the work, are treated in it,—the Christian religion, the church and its usages, poetry, history, great names of the past, philosophy, character, friendship, and many other topics connected with the various experiences of life. These portions of the volume should be separated from the rest, and, if it be thought that the world needs them, published by themselves. They would form a book, full alike of merits and of faults; interesting from its freshness and variety; worthy of perusal for being unusually packed with the fruits of observation, reading and meditation; composed in a rich, oracular style, showing, too evidently, both in substance of idea and in form of statement, imitative traces of the author's great neighbor; abounding in beautiful images happily caught at first hand from nature, in striking aphorisms, in really valuable original thoughts, and in suggestive hints; but, on the other side, interspersed with inexcusable crudities, with proofs of carelessness and lack of healthy moral discrimination, with contempt for things commonly esteemed holy, with reflections that must shock every pious Christian, with the transcendental

Digitized by Google

doctrines of the new-light school, with obscurities of incomprehensible mysticism, with ridiculous speculations, moon-struck reveries and flat nonsense,—without moral purpose in the writing, and without practical results in the reading.

Of that part of the work which would remain after this selection was made from it, which would constitute about one half of the original bulk, we find it difficult to speak in terms of sufficient praise. In wondrous beauty the minute facts of that memorable voyage glide along a stream transparent as crystal before our mind's eye, as we read; and they cling to our thoughts with a tenacity singularly close and pleasant. The boat by day, the tent by night, the toiling or reposing twain, the shifting hues of the clouds and the air as the circling hours roll on, every flower, fish, frog, tree, lowland, hill, nightly bay of watch-dog and distant tone of Sabbath-bell, pass before us, distinctly defined, in a clear, objective existence. The unexaggerated simplicity of description, the uncolored fidelity to fact, the perfect freedom from cant, the childlike earnestness of sympathy for outward things, the poetic eye for interior meaning, pathetic analogy and external beauty, the felicitous phraseology which calmly paints the exact objects themselves,—these traits are beyond commendation. They have combined to make a modern week on two New England rivers, as romantic and new as ever a week in by-gone ages on the Simöis and Xanthus of antique climes could have been.

We have read this history with unmingled delight. We wish the book contained nothing else. Then to travel by its means from the meadows of Concord to the summit of Agiocochook would be a great joy to any man. It is invested with a strange, long-lingering charm, an indescribable fascination for which we can hardly account, except by saying that it springs from its pure, naked truth. For with that the soul of all nature is in unison; to that the core of every heart is loyal, and responds, even when unconscious of it, with an instinctive pleasure.

We are glad to learn that the author intends soon to publish another volume, called,—Walden, or Life in the Woods. On such a theme, owing to his singular familiarity with nature and love for her, he is able to write a work that will not die. For the satisfaction and advantage of his readers, for his own fame, and for the wide distribution and long existence of his book, we beg him to let it be, simply, what its title imports, and not crowd it with heterogeneous thoughts upon a thousand other subjects. That is not his forte. If he persists in thinking that it is, then let him pursue it, by itself, with a set purpose. Great works are not achieved accidentally, by the wayside, our author's authority to the contrary notwithstanding. A—R.

Digitized by Google

8. Seventeenth Annual Report of the Trustees of the Perkins Institution and Massachusetts Asylum for the Blind, to the Corporation. Cambridge: 1849.

The institution, of which this is a Report, is one of the most praiseworthy in New England. Most of the blind pupils in it are supported by the several States whence they come, viz: Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and South Carolina. Their friends furnish them with clothing, and their education is provided for by the public. This report tells us that the number of inmates at the present time is ninety-four. It informs us of the readiness with which the States respond to the call in behalf of the blind. "Whenever the subject has been brought before the legislature of any state, and an appropriation asked for, it has been granted at once, without difficulty. A sum is appropriated and put at the disposition of the Governor, who issues warrants to the applicants, and pays to the Institution $160 per annum for each one. Massachusetts pays an outright sum annually, which is so liberal, that the doors of the Institution can be virtually opened to all applicants of proper age and character, without regard to the number." Indigent blind persons, of suitable age and character, belonging to Massachusetts, can be admitted gratuitously. Some improvements in the Institution are suggested, in the document before us, especially in reference to those who become suddenly blind by accident or disease. Appended to the Secretary's Report is an extract of the Directors' Report upon the Work Department of the Institution. Dr. S. G. Howe is still Secretary of the Board. He has been a devoted friend of the inmates of the institution, and a faithful servant of the public, for many years. J. G. A.

9. Christianity against Infidelity; or, The Truth of the Gospel History. Embracing a Preliminary Argument for the Existence of God, and the Reasonableness and Necessity of a Revelation; and a Review of Sceptical Philosophy. By Thomas B. Thayer. New Edition, Revised and Enlarged. Cincinnati: Published by John A. Gurley. 1849. 12mo. pp. 425.

We had begun to say that the merits of Mr. Thayer's "Christianity against Infidelity," as a clear and forcible exposition of the subject, were sufficiently known among us. But there came up in our recollection the mortifying disclosures of utter ignorance, and confident misapprehension, which appeared in our ranks, two or three years ago, respecting the evidences of the Gospel History, and we blotted the sentence, and commenced anew. It is indeed probable that most of the cases of downright infidelity are now removed from the ranks of our acting ministry, (though some of them are retained in our published Register of clerical

Digitized by Google

names;) yet there is reason to fear that we still need a much more thorough study than we have generally attended to, of the grounds on which the proofs of the Christian Revelation rest. For a summary sketch of the field, in outline, not too much encumbered with details, and still sufficiently filled up to render the whole a true picture, we know of no work that we could recommend before this of Mr. Thayer's. We hope it will be faithfully used, not only by the members of our churches, and by our families, but also by our preachers. We live in a time, as our experience has shown, when preachers of the gospel ought to be well versed in the evidences of divine revelation, so as to "be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh a reason of the hope that is in them, with meekness and fear."

The present edition is enlarged to nearly twice the amount of the first. The introductory chapters, on Natural Religion, and on the Need of a Divine Revelation, have been partly re-written, and considerably extended. In the body of the work, the testimonies, furnished by the early Heretics, to the genuineness of the Gospel History, and the acknowledgements of the early opposers of Christianity, are more fully presented; and the confirmation afforded by the various readings of Manuscripts, is illustrated. But the most important addition is an extended review of the recent Mythic hypothesis of Strauss. Into this the author enters with a determination to do full justice both to the theory itself of the great modern Coryphæus of doubters, and to the testing of it by acknowledged facts and by common-sense. We find, here, the substance of heavier volumes condensed, besides original illustrations which the ready mind of the author has supplied on several points.

We are struck with the manner in which this book appears to have been wrought out, so different from the way in which books are almost weekly got up for our market. It is evidently the fruit of long and thorough inquiry, and of patient, systematic thought. We feel, at the very first entering on the perusal, that we are following a student; one whose mind is well trained to the labor of investigation, and to the tact of balancing facts; who is master of his subject; who not only sees into it, but sees its outlines and its several departments. He evidently had his matter before him, well assorted, and each part standing in its true relations, when he began to write. Even the materials he had collected from others, had been digested in his mind till they became his own. With such preparation, it does an author good to write; and his work will do good to those who read it.

We have been looking for a place to thrust in some considerations on the "Laws of Nature," and we find no opening more

Digitized by Google

convenient than this; though we are not sure that our remarks will bear directly on any ground which our author intended to maintain. It appears to us that the proposition that what are called the laws of nature are but the action of God's will, is exposed to objection, if we mean that they are but the *immediate* action of God's will. The question is, indeed, merely a philosophical one, and as such it does not materially affect the grounds of religious faith. Now, as matter of fact, we find in all departments of nature such Organization as is adapted, and apparently designed, for the developement of some force answering to our ideas of Natural Laws. Thus, vegetables do not exist without a vegetable organization to carry on their growth; nor animals, without an animal organization for the like purpose. We also find, everywhere, fixed Conditions, under which each and every operation of nature is conducted,—conditions inseparable from the production of motion, crystallization, the phenomena of light, heat, of magnetism; so much matter to so much force of attraction; such kinds of matter to such kinds of effects; and so on, *universaliter*. Now, if the effects, in all these cases, are produced immediately by the volition only of God, why these invariably attendant organizations and conditions? which seem to be depositories of a finite power. The will of God, if that be immediately the sole power, operates on the unorganized particles, just as well as through what we call the requisite organic and conditional forms; unless we say, absurdly, that God's power, or absolute power, is rigorously conditioned. It makes a plant grow without its requisite soil, moisture, air, heat and sunshine, just as well as with these accompaniments, and produces all the other phenomena of nature without their respective conditions. Indeed, when we have found the sole and complete power for any phenomena, be it God's power or something else, we have got beyond all other conditions in the case; there are no other conditions. According to the supposed hypothesis, we should actually find the effects just as often without what we call the conditions, as with them; for they are not conditions.

Again: the hypothesis is virtually a denial of all our ideas of Cause and Effect *in nature;* since it admits of only one Cause, and that back of nature, not in it. It is a denial of all Secondary Causes, which both common sense and natural science recognize. This objection is but the full form of the first objection.

Finally: The same reasoning, *a priori*, that would prove God's will to be the only immediate power in this sense, and the impossibility of any secondary power deposited in nature, would also prove God to be the only being, and the impossibility of any other personality in the universe. A personality is something

Digitized by Google

that acts of itself in the same sense that Natural Laws (if there be any,) act of themselves: or rather, in a more complete sense. Accordingly, if there be no objections to the existence of separate personalities, there can be none, *a priori*, to the existence of Natural Laws, in the common sense of the phrase.

10. A Compendium of Ecclesiastical History. By Dr. John C. L. Gieseler, Consistorial Counsellor and Ordinary Professor of Theology in Göttingen. From the Fourth Edition, revised and amended. Translated from the German by Samuel Davidson, LL. D. Professor of Biblical Literature and Ecclesiastical History in the Lancashire Independent College. New York: Harper and Brothers, &c. 1849. 8vo. Vols. i. & ii.

Our countryman, Rev. Mr. Cunningham, translated Gieseler's work down to the Reformation, and published it, in three volumes, at Philadelphia, some thirteen years ago. Since that time, however, the original has been considerably improved and enlarged. The present version is made from the latest edition of the German, and, of course, contains the amendments and additions. This gives it an advantage over the former. Dr. Davidson professes also to have adhered closely to the original text, and seems to intimate that Mr. Cunningham used more license in this respect. Of neither fact are we prepared to judge by a comparison of the originals in the two cases. Only two volumes of the new translation have as yet appeared in this country; and they leave the history at A. D. 1073. If we may conjecture from the space occupied by the corresponding part in the former translation, it will require about two volumes more to reach the period of the Reformation.

Gieseler is distinguished for his impartiality, and, if compared with most of the Germans, for the sobriety of his judgement. He does not, like Neander, write ecclesiastical history as a theorist, but as an investigator, intent on getting the facts in their actual relations. There are two excellencies that belong also to the form of his work; an agreeable and natural arrangement, very different from the awkward one of Mosheim; and the perpetual illustration of his very condensed text by ample extracts from the original sources. This latter method enables us, aswe read, to go back into the times treated of, and to take the opinions of the fathers and controvertists in their own language untranslated, and sometimes untranslatable,—for their logic was often a verbal quibble. To those who read Greek and Latin with some facility, these Notes, or quotations, which occupy the larger part of the page, render the work much more valuable than any other Compendium of Church History that has appeared in this country. For the purposes, however, of the mere English scholar, the text

Digitized by Google

is too brief; and to him we would recommend Mosheim's, by Murdock. One or the other of these ought to be *studied*, before resorting to Neander. Milman's, as a history, may be dispensed with altogether.

11. Lectures on Modern History, from the Irruption of the Northern Nations to the close of the American Revolution. By William Smyth, Professor of Modern History in the University of Cambridge. Third American Edition, revised and corrected. With Additions: including a Preface, and a List of Books on American History, by Jared Sparks. Boston: Benjamin B. Mussey, and Company. 1849. 8vo. pp. 738.

The Lectures of Prof. Smyth need no commendation in our community at this day; and the name of the distinguished Editor of this volume will serve, better than any thing we can say, as an assurance to all our readers that it is prepared with care and thoroughness.

12. Sermons on Doctrinal and Moral Subjects. By G. W. Montgomery, Pastor of the First Universalist Society, Rochester, N. Y. Rochester: Printed and published by W. Heughes, &c. 1850. 18mo. pp. 216.

In this day of sermons on literature, Shakspeare, the fine arts, and "Progress" (we think it is called,) it is some praise of the discourses which fill this little volume, to say that they are religious in their tone, and that they look "to the law and to the testimony" for the light they dispense and for the spirit they impart. As the author's chief object in publishing them was to furnish his numerous friends with a keepsake—a remembrancer of the pastor whose sympathies they had shared, and of the preacher to whom they had listened,—we ought perhaps to regard them only as favorable specimens of his ordinary preparations for the pulpit. The views he presents on the several topics of which he treats, are such as are common in our connection, except on one point, the resurrection from the dead. He holds that this takes place, not at any one period simultaneously with all, but with each person immediately after death; that it is in no sense a physical resurrection, but that it consists in raising the soul by degrees to a higher moral and intellectual state hereafter. The passing from the present life into that state, he admits, is indeed instantaneous, but the resurrection, distinctively speaking, is not instantaneous, even with the individual; it is a gradual growth in holiness hereafter, or, if the person had died under the dominion of sin, it is, at first, a process of remorse with him as a means of his reconciliation and eventual blessedness.

We are inclined to think that a view of the resurrection as relating in no way to the body, and as immediate with every

Digitized by Google

person at his death, has rather increased among us, the last few years. For ourselves, we neither feel, nor have we ever been able to see, any objection to a course of moral discipline after death,—taking that doctrine distinct from other views that may be associated with it. But that the resurrection from the dead, spoken of in the New Testament, takes place with each individual at his decease, is, in our mind, beset with difficulties that are insurmountable. May we state some of them?

1. It is St. Paul's doctrine that Christ was "the first-fruits of them that had fallen asleep" or had died,—that he was "the first-born from the dead." Whereas, if men had always been rising from the dead ever since the time of Abel, it was by no means true that Christ was the first; that distinction belonged to Abel. It might as well have been said, in that case, that Christ was the first who died, as that he was "the first-born from the dead." St. Paul also describes the "order" in which all men were to be made alive in Christ, or raised from the dead as the context shows the meaning to be: "Christ the first-fruits; *afterwards* they that are Christ's, at his coming." Mankind were not to be raised till *after* Christ's resurrection, nor till the period here called "his coming;" but according to the hypothesis, the whole ancient world had preceded him in the resurrection, some of them four thousand years. Again: St. Paul says, "We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump; for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible." The raising of the dead he evidently looked upon as future, and at a particular period, not at all times just as people die. Nothing seems plainer to us, than that the whole tenor of 1 Cor. xv. recognizes the resurrection, there treated of, as a future event. "As in Adam all *die*," (this was a process then going on;) "even so in Christ shall all be made alive," (this was a process to be realized hereafter;) the dying, present; the rising, or being made alive, future. And then the apostle states the "order" still more emphatically, as we have already observed. And when that general harvest of the dead should take place, (which was to be "in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye,") then all things should have been subdued to Christ, who would deliver back the kingdom to the Father, and God be all in all.

2. The great central fact of the gospel has a bearing on this question. Even Christ, who was the first-fruits of the harvest, did not rise from the dead till the third day after his decease. If it is the law of God's economy, that men rise when they die, there was a departure from the rule, in Christ's case, not in favor of him, but to his disparagement. He lay under the dominion

Digitized by Google

of death, for "three days and three nights," as other men do not. Instead of having the preëminence in the resurrection, he was put to disadvantage. Whereas, it is the evident view of the inspired writers, that the departure from the general rule was immeasurably in his favor; that he was not left under the power of death, as other men are, but that God, in a signally speedy manner, loosed its pains, it not being possible that he should be held by them.

3. Lazarus of Bethany lay four days in death, before Christ recalled him to this mortal state. Does it appear that he had, in the interim, risen to immortality? So, too, of the young man at Nain, &c.

These are some of the difficulties that seem to us insurmountable in the way of the hypothesis. Quite as strong an argument, we think, might be gathered against it, from the general direction in which the New Testament contemplates the subject, wherever it is introduced or referred to,—from the incidental allusions, the considerations casually associated with it, &c. Let one, when meeting with passages of this kind, attempt to read into them the idea of a resurrection clearly defined as simultaneous with each person's death, and he will find that he has not only to wrench hard at here and there a text, but also to go against the natural current of the language everywhere. Prof. Bush, who is, or was, the leading advocate of the hypothesis, acknowledged, if our memory serves us, that it differed, in form, from the New Testament doctrine, and that the apostles represented the resurrection as future and simultaneous with all men. He thought to go down beneath their views, and to get at the reality, which they did not reach. We must not forget that when the Professor published his book on the subject, he was already somewhat dazed with the dawn of that new-revelation light which afterwards rose upon him in the full day of Swedenborgianism.

13. The National Speaker: containing Exercises, original and selected, in Prose, Poetry, and Dialogue, for Declamation and Recitation; and An Elocutionary Analysis, exhibiting a clear explanation of principles, with rules for each element of oral expression, practically illustrated in a systematic course of lessons. By Henry B. Maglathlin, A. M., Author of "The Practical Elocutionist." Boston: Published by Robert S. Davis. 1849. 12mo. pp. 324.

We have seldom opened a work on Elocution which has so highly pleased us as this. The great and increasing interest felt, especially by teachers of the young, on the subject of reading and speaking, has long demanded such a work; and we are pleased to find that the author has so ably met this demand. The aim of the work is at least threefold. First, to give a full

Digitized by Google

and clear idea of the nature and powers of the simplest elements of our language, together with rules for their proper enunciation. Secondly, to describe and illustrate, by striking examples, the qualities of voice appropriate to the different kinds of composition. Thirdly, to present an ample and varied selection of extracts for illustration and practice.

The exercises in Articulation are decidedly the best we have ever seen, and should be in the hands of every student. The remarks on the proper management of the voice are valuable, and well adapted to the minds of youth, and by no means distasteful to persons of mature age. The selection of extracts for declamation is a judicious one, comprising, besides many old specimens of choice literature, a number of new and interesting extracts from living authors. The work, although peculiarly adapted to minds somewhat matured, is still valuable to students in all periods of their course. We think it richly deserves the patronage to which it aspires. S. G.

14. Three Questions proposed and answered, concerning the Life forfeited by Adam, the Resurrection of the Dead, and Eternal Punishment. By David Thom, D. D., Jena, Ph. D., Heidelberg; Minister, formerly of the Scotch Church, Rodney Street, now of Bold Street Chapel, Liverpool. Third Edition. &c. London: &c. &c. 1849. 12mo. pp. 170.

Perhaps our readers have some notion of the peculiar characteristics of Dr. Thom's general system of doctrine. If we mistake not, it is purely dialectic, and more congenial, in this respect, with the theological mind of England than of this country. In the present work, he contends, if we understand him, that the life forfeited by Adam was "creature righteousness," the loss of which was followed by the death of the body; that the cause of our resurrection is, not any natural immortality in our being, but the resurrection of the Lord Jesus; and that we have no authority in the Scripture for the doctrine of eternal punishment, nor indeed for the common doctrine of punishment in the future state. Each of these points is argued at considerable length, in very systematic forms; but we confess that to us his logic seems often to go no deeper than words. We see that his words hold an exact relation to each other; but in many cases we do not see the things that he means by them.

15. Dante's Divine Comedy: The Inferno. A literal Prose Translation, with the Text of the Original collated from the best editions, and Explanatory Notes. By John A. Carlyle, M. D. &c. New York: Harper and Brothers, &c. 1849. 12mo. pp. 375.

We have been much pleased with this prose translation by a brother of the famous critic and humorist Carlyle. If Carey's

Digitized by Google

excellent version is more harmonious, and more agreeable at first opening, this faithful transcript (as we take it to be,) seems to let us more directly into the poet's mind and manner, and gains in interest as we read on, till we soon prefer it to the former. The Notes are abundant, apparently written with great care, and furnish all the explanations we need. To those who would form some acquaintance with the original, the Italian text on the page below the English, affords peculiar facilities.

16. Southey's Common-Place Book. Edited by his Son-in-law, John Wood Warter, B. D. New York: Harper and Brothers, &c. 1849. 8vo. pp. 416.

There are many curious extracts in this volume; but, on the whole, we have been somewhat disappointed in its contents,—perhaps, because we had unreasonable expectations. The passages, however, which such a man as Southey thought worth transcribing, must be worth reading, at least of looking into.

17. The Rose of Sharon: a Religious Souvenir, for 1850. Edited by Mrs. C. M. Sawyer. Boston: A. Tompkins, and B. B. Mussey & Co. 1849. 16mo. pp. 304.

We received this volume at so late a period that we have had no opportunity to peruse it. On turning over its leaves, however, we see enough to assure us that it maintains the long-established excellence of the work. We meet with the same familiar names that have heretofore marked the many-hued blossoms of the Rose, and with some that appear, this season, for the first time,—worthy companions in the cluster. But that one, which gave a richer and more etherial glory to the others, is missing here,—

> "Transplanted in that realm of rest,
> Where roses never die,
> Amid the gardens of the blest,
> Beneath a stormless sky."

It is well that her memory and her name should always be associated with the "Rose of Sharon"; and it is pleasant to see with how deep a sympathy her successor enters on her charge. It is needless to say that Mrs. Sawyer is well qualified, by native talents, by practice and culture, to sustain the character of the work, and to realize the expectations of its former patrons.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Acme
Bookbinding Co., Inc.
300 Summer Street
Boston, Mass. 02210

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google